

that they are the exceptions. I will take an example and stand by it any Jew, any immigrant, humble immigrant—I will take the average Jewish immigrant. Where will you find him? You will find him in the factories, you will find him in the shops, you will find him back of the restaurant, you will find him doing the most laborious work from the moment he lands here until he is laid away. What is he doing it for? He is doing it because he has come here for one great purpose, and that is to give his children an opportunity which was denied to him and his ancestors for centuries. This humble Jewish immigrant, and he is typical of 100 out of 1,000, knows the land the moment he gets here, thanks God for his arrival here, and it is an uninterrupted, continuous life of sweat and labor from that moment to the very end. His children know no other land, owe allegiance to no other flag, have no other country but the United States. I speak for the Jewish immigrant because I have the honor of representing a great Jewish district, and I will say that there are no more loyal people in this country than the Jewish immigrants and their children. The children of the Jewish immigrant, given an opportunity of an education, they will take their place in the community; and in every city where Jewish immigrants have settled I will show you development, progress, business industry as the result of their labor, determination and efforts.

The Italian immigrants—let us take the most humble again as an example—having a country, unlike the Jew, a country that was his for centuries, where the sky is clear and the climate good, where he is surrounded by beauty that has been his for generations, leaves that home for the same laudable reason that prompted the Jewish immigrant. To come here he sells his little piece of land, his little home, and knocks at the door of Ellis Island for admission. He lands, and where do you find him? You see him with the pack and the old building over his shoulders, digging out canals, boring our highways, or in the depths of our mines. He saves money, you see. Yes, saves money and saves money so that he may send to the other side for his wife and babies or for his bride who is awaiting him, and he establishes his little home, he builds his little home—you know, the little house of an Italian laborer, no matter how humble, and I will show you every inch of the ground of his back garden cultivated as a garden. I will show you every place where there is space enough for one seed a beautiful flower. I will show you that Italian laborer on his day of rest, with his coat on, working around his home to beautify it—it is his only love that he wants to make it a real home. Come to our schools in New York and you will see hundreds of thousands of little black-headed sons of Italians peering over their heads in the grade schools, in the high schools preparing themselves for the duties and responsibilities of American citizenship. Is it fair, is it really, is it accurate to paint an instance here and there out of a population running into millions of a crime committed and hold that such a case is typical of the immigration of an entire race? The Greeks, hard working, honest, industrious, you will find in the mines all over the country, and what better example of assimilation than that of the Greek and the Italian—who on the other side a Greek and an Italian can not get along, they have been instigated and primed to hate each other by the cunning and treachery of European politics. They come here, work side by side, live in the same neighborhood, their children go to the same schools, no hatred, no hard feeling, living in perfect harmony, friendship, and love, their children intermarry. Why? Because they have immediately become entirely and absolutely assimilated. They are Americans in thought, spirit, and in attitude, and yet you come here and say that this newer immigration can not be assimilated.

Gentlemen, you will have to find some other justification for this law. I do not hesitate to say why I am against it. I am against it because it is unscientific, because it does not fit with the economic condition of the country, because it is the result of narrow-mindedness and bigotry, and because it is inspired, prompted and urged by influences who dare not come out in the open, by the influence who have no intelligent information of conditions, but who have a fixed obsession on Anglo-Saxon superiority, who have an obsession as to religious dogmas, and who believe that it is proper to take vengeance upon these humble, harmless, despised immigrants. In the course of the work discussed by themselves in themselves, and in so doing believe they are rendering service to their country.

I feel sorry for them. As was stated by the very gentlemen who are opposing this bill in a beautiful article the district they represent have no immigration problem, to me their own people. If these people could only see, could only hear, could only know, they would understand. If they could observe in

an unbiased manner the immigrant in his labors, in his work, their children in their studies, their development and progress, their devotion to the country, all of this prejudice and fear would disappear and how much happier we would be in this country if we could abolish former religious differences, racial hatreds, and concentrate all our efforts and reconsecrate ourselves as one people, regardless of race or weight to service and united loyalty to our country.

While the Jewish immigration is not charged to any country because it comes from various parts of Europe, I think it can be approximately located. We have no statistics of religious as far as I can ascertain, and prior to 1920 statistics account for country of origin only. That would leave an entirely to the immigration records which sometimes classify immigrants as Hebrew nationality. From my own experience at Ellis Island I find that this classification is incorrect owing to many Jewish immigrants being classified as American, Hungarian, Russian, or Polish. The Census Bureau in the 1920 census compiled statistics in accordance to "mother tongue of the foreign white stock" and from that it will be seen that 1,051,820 were classified as "Yiddish and Hebrew mother tongue," with a total of 2,043,012. Of these 1,051,820 were foreign born, classified principally as follows:

Russia	781,181
Austria	90,277
Rumania	27,281
Hungary	16,964
Poland	5,545
Greece	2,120
Czechs	2,067

The remainder being scattered among foreign countries, principally, I believe, Jewish immigrants from the above-named countries who emigrated first to another country.

Several explanations have been offered why the 1920 census is now taken and why the 1910 census was taken in the original great law. The truth of it, gentlemen, is that the 1910 census was taken because at the time the original act was approved on May 19, 1902, it was the last United States census and the only census that should have been taken. You will find that the 1920 census was transmitted by the Director of the Census to the Department of Commerce on November 21, 1921, the census containing the number of foreign born in this country. The census of 1910 was not arbitrarily taken, as some might have been led to believe. When the original act was enacted it was the last census. Since then the 1920 census has been made available. As I said just a moment ago, the percentage of whatever percentage you desire should be based on the last available census, namely, 1920, as was done in the original act in 1902.

I pointed out, gentlemen, in my remarks Saturday when the rule was under consideration that the doors are left wide open on the Mexican line. I stated—and no one dared contradict, because the report of the Commissioner General of Immigration shows that 25,000 Mexicans entered the United States last year, and that the Secretary of Labor has publicly stated that an equal number unlawfully entered. It is not disputed that several hundred thousands came in in 1921 and 1922 and that they have not left the United States but are going from place to place where cheap labor is needed and where manufacturers or growers are specially anxious to want to exploit this poor labor at the expense of natives, yes, and of decent immigrants who come here to make their home and want to live up to the American standard. So that as long as the proponents of this measure permit the intolerable condition of the exploitation of cheap Mexican labor at starvation wages then they can not be heard to say that they are seeking to protect American wages and the American standard of living.

Let me point out some of the testimony given before the committee and received with a great deal of interest by the committee. Mr. W. H. Satterfield appeared. He stated he was not a real estate promoter but interested in the development of the "alluvial territory" along the Mississippi River and its tributaries. To give you an idea first of this gentleman's attitude toward immigrants, he stated, and you will find his testimony on page 1072 of the hearing:

We believe there has been too much of the sort of Europe, so to speak, to use the original expression, coming into this country.

Then, again, he says, on page 1073:

The reason we have been advocating a selective form of immigration is because we made "a survey of those sorts that come over here." If you will pardon that common expression, to see if we could not isolate them.

I mention these expressions to show the attitude of this gentleman toward these very people that he seeks to bring to his "alluvial territory" and bids the committee to be not a real

estate promoter. This very "scum" these "birds" that he refers to, ought to be induced, he asks, to go out to his territory.

Mr. VAILE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAQUARDIA. Yes.

Mr. VAILE. Does the gentleman know how far he got with that proposition?

Mr. LAQUARDIA. I am telling you.

Mr. VAILE. Let me tell the gentleman that the southern Members of the committee repudiated that proposition with the same scorn they would repudiate a proposition to let in unmanageable people from any where else.

Mr. LAQUARDIA. But he was in favor of your bill, nevertheless.

The negroes can not do the work, continues Mr. Satterfield, and because he claims, will not till the undeveloped ground. Then, the witness continues, he does not want to drive from other sources of the country, although later on he says an attempt was made and he just could not get people to go down to his physical territory after "combining the country." What does he offer them? He offers them to go down, make you this is not a land scheme at all, says he, to buy the land, he will finance it, says he, and he wants \$10 an acre for this undeveloped land and he holds this "promise" for 14 years at \$10 an acre. In other words, he wants the immigrant to go there, stay on his land for 14 years, pay \$140 a acre for absolutely unutilized undeveloped land which the poor immigrant himself has to develop, and by the time he has developed the land at the end of 14 years he will be so much in debt, an every farmer in this country knows, that what he will have to do is to pick up and go to some place near by, leaving the fruit of 14 years of labor of himself and his family to this gentleman Mr. Satterfield and his corporation. Why, this offer is so attractive that he is unable to find anyone in this country who will accept his generosity. He states on page 1004 of the hearing, "We are sending out pamphlet literature to try to get people in the Southland to take cotton," and yet he can not get them, notwithstanding that he points a pretty picture as to the possibilities of cotton and the high price of cotton in the future, although some of the very gentlemen from the Southland who will vote on this bill will take every opportunity to protest, and properly so, against conditions in the Cotton Belt and the need of doing something for the cotton grower.

Again to show the attitude of this gentleman Mr. Satterfield:

If there is a Greek—

He says at page 1084—

There is the traditional confusion, at a few of these dark-complected negroes, we do not know if there are a few of these Italians down there that are commonly called "daggers." If white folks are with them, I do not know it.

What is splendid type of man to come forward and suggest a colonization scheme to make huddlers out of the immigrant. A swell claims the poor, unfortunate immigrant who falls victim to the claws of this man with hatred in his heart, seeking to get rich on the labor and exploitation of the poor immigrant. He wants to stock up this land with Nordics and on behalf of the Nordics I protest against any such land scheme—any such promotion scheme—and I tell you right now if you are friends of the Nordics you will prevent them from becoming the victims of Mr. Satterfield and his gang of exploiters of human beings.

Believe me is made from time to time concerning the statistics of aliens in our insane asylums. Gentlemen, when you refer to statistics in an insane asylum and you charge that to racial causes when you charge that to immigration, I say with all due deference and respect that you do not know what you are talking about. It is true we have aliens in our insane asylums in New York, and you have them in other asylums in other parts of the country, but, gentlemen, they are not there because they are aliens. If they were at home and never came to this country they would not be in an insane asylum. If instead of aliens we had to draw entirely from your native Nordic stock to put in our factories, in our mills, in our shops, under the river-boring channels, the toll of the industry of modern industry under our production system, just as your toll of death and casualties of war, you would have an equal number in these insane asylums of your preferred Nordic stock. It is the pressure, the tension of modern machine industry to which human beings are subjected that accounts for the number of insane. It is the constant continuous go, go, of your big industrial centers that breaks the human system. Do not believe that in stopping immigration from Italy and Hungary and Greece that you are going to stop insanity. As long as

under the present competitive system we use human beings as cogs in a machine we will have our insane asylums occupied. No greater mistake has ever been made than to charge that root up to immigration. Charge it up where it belongs—to the inevitable casualties and cost of modern industry, competitive system, and the existing economic condition under which we are living.

Let me give you a few statistics as a proof of the industry and thrift of the alien. Let us not take Atlanta or the insane asylum, and I believe that a careful, honest, unbiased analysis of the figures of either of these institutions would wipe away entirely the conclusions presented by the sponsors of this measure, but let us take the records of the postal savings banks. Surely these figures are not fudged. I have before me the annual report of the operation of the Postal Savings System for 1923 as contained in the letter from the Postmaster General to the Speaker of the House of Representatives dated December 6, 1923, Sixty-eighth Congress, first session, document 100. The gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. Brantley), who is as keen and able a Representative as there is in this House and for whom I have the greatest admiration, took the floor last Saturday in defense of this restrictive immigration measure and finished in an eloquent expression that in his district he did not have one-half of 1 per cent of alien population. The gentleman from South Carolina hails from the city of Aiken, and according to the report of the Postmaster General there is not a single solitary depositor in the city of Aiken in the postal savings system of the United States. Today the gentleman from Chattanooga brought out the same point, and we had there are just 22 depositors in the postal savings bank. Mr. Clegg who comes from Lima, Ohio, and in the city of Lima there are just 18 depositors having funds in the Postal Savings System, and the energetic whiff, the gentleman from Anderson, Ind. (Mr. Tamm), who made a passionate appeal for restriction immigration a few days ago, we find that he has 31 depositors in his city putting their savings with the postal system. Now, along comes the gentleman from California (Mr. Hiram), a member of the committee, and he, too, refers to these terrible aliens and in the city of Alhambra, Calif., from whence the gentleman comes, there is just one depositor with \$10 deposit, and I bet you a dollar to a doughnut that that \$10 comes from some little Greek peanut dealer who has saved a penny at a time. The chairman of the committee, Mr. Jackson, who is given to the country by the citizens of Bozeman, Wash., boasts of 149 depositors in the postal savings bank, while the champion of restriction, the gentleman from Colorado, Mr. Vane, coming from Denver, has 1,000 depositors, and knowing Denver as I do, I tell you that if you inspect the list of the depositors ranking up this 1,000 you will find they are Italians, Jews, and Poles, and among the foreign population of the city of Denver who rank up the list.

Now, let us take New York City, my little town with its terrible, tremendous foreign population. When you mention it you say and you refer to it as the violent and that you are seeking to obliterate. Why, my town has 180,000 depositors with a total deposit in Uncle Sam's bank of \$50,486,525, out of a total savings in the entire United States of \$131,071,800 (approximately), and if you will take the centers where you have large foreign populations and add them up you will see how much is left in the territories where there is no foreign population and who are bounding their Congressman to pass this vicious law. From an inspection of the list from New York City you will find that it is the humble Jew, Italian, Pole, Russian, and Greek immigrant bringing his savings to Uncle Sam because he trusts him, because he knows him, because he loves him, and because he is here to stay. These savings represent the sweat of their brow, the fruit of their honest labor, their part and contribution to the wealth, greatness, and the welfare of their adopted country.

I am willing to take the savings not only in Uncle Sam's savings bank but the savings banks generally, and show you where you have big foreign populations, you have big savings deposits. You tell us that these immigrants are a drain on the country; that they send money home. How contrary to American spirit, to real American generosity, it is to throw into their face the few pennies of their hard-earned money which they send to an aged parent or to a poor relative. The figures of the postal savings bank to Uncle Sam's bank are figures which tell that statement and show entirely the contrary to be true, that these millions of newly arrived immigrants not only contribute to the country their labor but see the fruits of their labor for the benefit of the entire country by putting it in these institutions.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAQUARDIA. Yes.

Mr. WATKINS. They are contributing something else, too. The Attorney General says that despite the fact that the foreign born is less than 11 per cent, they contribute more than 50 per cent of the criminal record in this country.

Mr. LAQUADRIA. If the gentleman had been in this Chamber when I began my remarks, he would have heard my statement on that point. If you take the average, you will find that it is nothing like 58 much as 10 per cent. While that is suggested by the gentleman from Oregon, let me say that the way to assimilate, the way to teach Americanism is by setting a good example. You talk about keeping out radicalism; you talk about keeping out Bolshevism. You can not keep it out by an immigration law or by a censorship. But we are in no danger of radicalism or Bolshevism in this country.

Our form of government is as perfect a form of government as imperfect human beings can live under. The way to keep out radicalism and Bolshevism is to put honest, decent officials in office, and kick out officials who betray the confidence of the people. That is the way to do it. Set a good example to these new Americans. [Applauds.] Let us end these hatreds, these prejudices; let us restore to the people the kind of representative government the liberty-loving framers of our Constitution intended, and drive from public office men who have ruined the trust given them. By all means let our conduct on the floor of this House be an example and inspiration to every honest, ardent, intelligent American folk. American manhood and the spirit of brotherhood and love which our Republic typifies.

Mr. OLIVER of New York. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAQUADRIA. Yes.

Mr. OLIVER of New York. May I say to the gentleman, in regard to Oregon, that the district court of appeals recently declared the American law passed by referendum in the great State of Oregon, where our teacher on Americanism comes from.

Mr. LAQUADRIA. That is correct. The forceful gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. McFARLAND] criticized a meeting I attended. Gentlemen, that meeting was public; everybody could come to that meeting, and at that meeting everybody's face was visible. [Applauds.]

Yet the opponents of this bill were directly charged with being influenced by the aliens in our respective districts. It has been repeatedly stated by the sponsors of this bill that persons were being brought to bear by the foreign-born citizens. I say in reply to that that the foreign-born citizens as I know him, and I think I know him intimately, would not ask their representative in Congress to vote against any measure that was for the good of the entire country, and I say with equal force that where the foreign born is made the target of a small organized authority who do not understand him and who refuse to learn to know him are directly forming legislation to hurt him and his family at the expense of the welfare of the country. It is only natural that loyal American citizens should call upon their chosen representatives in Congress and ask them to oppose this measure. There has been no secret about it; private meetings have been held in every large center. Petitions have been filed right here in the market, witnesses have appeared before the committee—how can you create any improper influence out of anything out of a movement carried on in the open honestly. A great deal has also been said about the foreign press. The foreign press is not the only kind of press taking an interest in this proposition. I have here in my hands a publication which has featured restrictive immigration legislation for a long time. If you will read the Flery Cross of January 12, 1924, you will find there an alarming headline entitled "American Heritage Menaced," says Doctor Evans; and when Dr. Evans says, "Why, the Flery Cross says that he is no less than their imperial wizard, Knights of the Ku-Klux Klan, and a five-column article carrying the imperial wizard's views, opinions, and instructions to Congress is printed in detail in the Flery Cross publication of the hooded knights." Then the imperial wizard says:

Ku-Klux Klanmen have been underlying it for some years, and now many leading American journals and publishers are sounding a deep and loud alarm. Action can not be too quick. Something has been done, but not enough; the work lies in but a step in the right direction. However, silence, loyalty, and moral delinquency are still pending to open the floodgates and streaming into cities to make modern Babylon and Gomorrah. By 1930, 85 per cent of our population was of the Nordic type—Caucasian, desirable, easily assimilable people. . . . What terrible creatures have brought to this country, if the Ku-Klux Klan has anything to say—and it is going to have something to say—whether shall we turn down to political machines we shall be dragged down to these and infidelity.

And in the Flery Cross issue of Friday, March 23, 1924, we find that the energetic gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CANTER] put the floor leader of the majority on record and required him to do so in writing, according to the news report in the flaming paper, and I read:

CONGRESSMAN CANTER, one of the sponsors of the immigration bill, was determined that a vote be urged with the least possible delay, so he obtained the following written promise from Mr. LOWENWART:

Then the written promise we find was the statement given to the press by Mr. LOWENWART in outlining the legislative program of the House some 10 days ago and I quote from the so-called written promise as contained in the paper:

The immigration bill will be considered immediately following the passage of these bills.

The bills referred to being the regular appropriation bills.

Then turning the page of the Flery Cross to the editorial section, we find this startling pronouncement:

For there was one not to be spared of it, it said it stated that Ohio is one of the chief strongholds of the Klan, making next to Indiana, which at this time leads the Nation in Klan work. Making Ohio as a single unit, Dayton is one of the strongest Klan cities in Ohio. Dayton is "Klan all through."

And then let me read the next editorial criticizing one of the great New York dailies, the Brooklyn Eagle, and it is not necessary for me to go to the defense of that great daily. There is no better, more loyal nor square daily in this whole country than the Brooklyn Daily Eagle. That paper is not of bi-political faith, nor of any school of politics. It often criticizes us and does so squarely, but I will say right here that its ownership, its editorial staff, is of the very highest type of Americans, and nothing that may be said by the Flery Cross can in the slightest affect the standing of that paper or its personnel. But let me read:

The entire country is aware that the Catholic and the Jew are for unrestricted immigration. Americans, however, are not. They are the deadly menace that faces America at this critical time. It is possible that the editor of the Eagle, too, sees the menace; but with less than 1,000,000 people who are of white Protestant, Gentile, American extraction in a city of approximately 5,000,000 souls, it is only natural that the Eagle should pay to the overwhelming majority.

There is hardly any doubt but that the editor really does not see the people of New York City are not for it. Every kind person should send the Eagle editor a map of the United States that he might learn that America only starts in New York and runs clear to the Pacific Ocean before stopping. Also inform him that the opinion of "the average New Yorker" is not necessarily the opinion of the millions of American west of Jersey City.

I read these quotations to show the warp-minded attitude of the official organ of the hooded organization and to demonstrate the one-sidedness of its argument; why, gentlemen, every Member of this House knows that the word at the door leader is his hand. The Flery Cross of April 4, 1924, states that thousands of letters are being received by Mr. JOHNSON from New York, and that New Yorkers complain that they have to depend upon Congressman JOHNSON and upon the efforts of the Ku-Klux Klan, because their Representatives in Congress are going to vote against the bill. Why, gentlemen, I have a whole file full of the publications, and I say to you that the leaders responsible for the activities of the Ku-Klux Klan are doing more to divide this country and to divide the people of a country than any agency that ever existed in the history of the world. These arguments, these articles, are read all over the country. You can not prevent the people of the East forming their opinion of this organization.

They can not understand how you can stand up for Americanism, how you want to shut the doors against those who you believe do not understand American traditions, and how, in the darkness of night, these same people, with masks or hoods, will take some poor defenseless negro and chastise him by corporal punishment or by burning him, and burning down the houses of the poor undefended negro—they can not understand why, in order to create law and fear, to establish brutal dominance, it is necessary to burn the very symbol of Christianity, which they have been brought up from infancy to revere and worship; they can not understand why it is that this organization has directed its activities and the power of its organized force at a group of people, of race, and religious who are defenseless, who want to take their place in the one big American family. Do you not see what harm is being done, what irreparable harm is being done, and in the name of the same God we all worship and for the glory of our only flag, I ask the Ku-Klux Klan to take off their mask and to meet us in the light of day to

tell these things over and to act in accordance with the best interests and in accordance with the tradition and spirit of America.

I will tell you gentlemen that he who steals my purse steals trash but he who attempts to take my Americanism away from me takes all I have and all that is dear to me. Gentlemen, I was raised out in the big State of Arizona, and anyone who seeks to question that Americanism, I do not care how big he is, will do so at his peril. (Applause.)

Mr. BAKER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. L. GUARDIA. Certainly.

Mr. BAKER. Would the gentleman mind telling the committee, if he knows, about an organization composed of about 150000 people with about 150,000 members to which you can not belong unless you speak and write a foreign language?

Mr. L. GUARDIA. Yes; and for the full the gentleman something.

Mr. BAKER. I am asking for information.

Mr. L. GUARDIA. I want to be perfectly fair. Let me inform my colleagues that he is laboring under a mistaken translation. I have their for-laws and have had a translation made. What it says is: "Without regard to language, religion, or political affiliations." I have a correct translation here, Mr. BAKER.

Mr. BAKER. I am asking for information.

Mr. L. GUARDIA. Well, the gentleman has obtained it. The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 20 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state to the gentleman from California that the present condition of the time does not permit that.

Mr. BAKER. We have from now until half past 5 o'clock, and I was to have one-fourth of that time.

The CHAIRMAN. Let the Chair state what the parliamentary situation is. By the rules of the House the time is divided four hours on a side. As a subsequent unanimous consent agreement after the expiration of that time, the general debate will run on until recess, and run on commencing at 8 o'clock until the House shall adjourn, which shall not be later than 11 o'clock. That Chair has no means of knowing whether there will be any more than eight hours used, and except by unanimous consent the Chair will allow the gentleman from Washington ten four hours until after the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. BAKER) has exhausted four hours.

Mr. BAKER. May I inquire how much time the gentleman from Washington (Mr. JOHNSON) has remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington has perfectly used two hours and two and a half minutes, and has 15 minutes the gentleman from California (Mr. BAKER) 1 hour and 50 minutes, which leaves the gentleman from Washington with one minute and a half.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. That will be sufficient for me to close the debate.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois has consumed 7 hours and 41 minutes. I have no doubt there will be plenty of time for this speech, but—

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, that the gentleman from California have 15 minutes in addition to the time remaining to his credit and that the gentleman from Illinois have 11 minutes additional.

Mr. BAKER. In addition to the time I have left?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Yes; that the gentleman from Illinois have 10 minutes additional.

Mr. BAKER. In other words, that I have as much time additional as the gentleman will use above his time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. That will be 15 minutes additional, and hereafter we will see about the hour of closing.

Mr. MAIDEN. Reserving the right to object, I understand the gentleman from Washington has one and a half minutes, and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. BAKER) has 15 minutes, and that closes the debate.

Mr. BAKER. I have four minutes.

Mr. MAIDEN. And the gentleman from California four minutes. This would close the debate with 3 o'clock to-night.

Mr. BAKER. No; we had an agreement that it should run until we adjourned, which would be at half past 5 or 6 o'clock tonight. That was the agreement this morning, the gentleman from Illinois will recall.

Mr. BAKER. That was the unanimous consent agreement for debate yesterday, as I understand it.

Mr. MAIDEN. Let us see what you are going to do with me time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I am perfectly willing that the gentleman from California (Mr. BAKER) shall have 15

minutes in addition to the 4 minutes and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. BAKER) 15 minutes additional.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is of the impression that the Committee of the Whole can not by unanimous consent change the order set by the House, and the Chair is of the opinion that until the eight hours have been exhausted the Chair must follow the order which was directed by the House, and that even by unanimous consent in the committee we can not change it. I might suggest to the gentleman from Illinois that if he desires to yield time to the gentleman from California, on the resumption the House will have plenty of additional time, the gentleman can do so; but as far as the Chair is concerned, he will leave the time in the control of the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Chairman, for the convenience of the House, I am willing to yield the time to the gentleman from California now, with the understanding that later on I will be yielded that time back by the gentleman from Washington.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington yields to the gentleman from California the balance of his time.

Mr. BAKER. And I yield him the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. And the gentleman from Illinois yields the balance of his time, and therefore, under the rule, the gentleman from California is recognized for fifteen minutes and a half.

Mr. BAKER. And also my four minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Yes.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the House, I do not know whether a man ought to attempt to qualify himself or not, but I feel I ought to say just a word or two on this matter before proceeding.

For 13 years I have been a member of this committee. I assisted in the bill when President Taft was in office, and it was vetoed; and then, as a member of the committee during the legislation that brought about the act of 1917, which was vetoed twice and then passed over the President's veto and also assisted in the subsequent legislation.

The Committee on Immigration was given the power to study the immigration question. The committee took testimony in Washington and went to New York and other places and spent two months and a half in the Western States taking testimony relative to immigration.

In addition to that, during the last year I spent practically all of my time after the adjournment of Congress in March 4 in going over the United States and visiting practically all the cities of the United States. I spent two and a half months in the Hawaiian Islands and I visited every island and saw every sugar plantation there except one. I visited every nationality and every organization that had any headquarters. I went there at my own expense and in my own time for the purpose of seeing the situation. I then again crossed the American continent and spent over two and a half months in Europe, having been there three years before, shortly after the armistice, when we went over a great part of Europe. This last time I went there for the purpose of seeing the conditions as they then existed and as they exist now.

In addition to this the committee has taken possibly 8,000 pages of testimony during the last four years. We have heard every conceivable question that relates to immigration discussed. We have studied the Mexican situation. We have gone into the labor situation, and we have gone into the different methods that have been suggested.

Mr. MAIDEN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BAKER. I yield.

Mr. MAIDEN. Now that the gentleman has given us a certificate of his own qualifications, I would like to ask him what it was that induced him and the rest of the committee to leave the floodgates open for the admission of people from Mexico.

Mr. BAKER. In one word I will answer that. The committee gave great thought to that question. We had 25 or 30 witnesses before us some four years ago and went into it in every particular, and the committee also looked into the law, and I am convinced absolutely that with the literacy test and the head-tax provision, and under the law regarding contract labor, I will say to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois, I believe, as I believe I am standing here, that if the contract labor law was enforced to-day there would not be a thousand Mexicans who would cross the border.

That is the reason we did not pass on that.

Mr. MAIDEN. How would it be enforced?

Mr. BAKER. They took across 78 guards away about four years ago. It took men and money to enforce it. A man told me the other day, confided under oath before another committee, that he saw 50 Chinese a week on the border. The re-

spectors were within half a mile. They walked up to the immigration station and said they wanted to be sent back to China.

Mr. SARATH. Is it not a fact that daily Mexicans do come here under the law?

Mr. BAKER. No; they do not; if the law was enforced they would not do so.

Mr. SARATH. They do come in legally?

Mr. BAKER. They do not come in legally. I stand on that as I stand on my two feet here.

Mr. SARATH. The department says—

Mr. BAKER. I do not care what the department says.

Mr. BUCKSTEIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAKER. Yes; I yield.

Mr. BUCKSTEIN. How does the gentleman justify the exclusion of families and children and that they have to reside in Mexico 10 years before it gives them the right to come in?

Mr. BAKER. Well, it does not mean that. That is intended for people who have been advised to get in that way. There would be a perfect stream of steamships going to Mexico if there was no limitation, and that was intended that if they went to Mexico they would have to live there 10 years before they could come in. That was to plug up that hole.

There has been much discussion here as to the ineligible classes—those ineligible as citizens of the United States. I will make the statement here now that this bill as now presented does not violate a single treaty that has been entered into by the United States with any foreign government. I make that statement and stand on it, and will be prepared to meet it if it comes up later.

There has been only one treaty since the formation of this Government whereby we dealt with immigration, and that treaty was with China. That has been abrogated, and we have now an exclusion law. Since the beginning of the Government we said that those people of the race on the Pacific coast, such as Malays, and Chinese, and Japanese and others were not entitled to be citizens, and that they could not be naturalized. That has been the law for 127 years. The Supreme Court of the United States has decided that Chinese can not be naturalized. The Supreme Court of the United States says that Hindus can not be naturalized, and the Supreme Court of the United States has said the Japanese could not be naturalized. The Supreme Court of the United States has said that Hindus can not be naturalized, as well as every Malay. So from the beginning of the Government those people can not be naturalized under our fundamental law, which has been the law down to the present time.

For the last 20 years the people of the West have been struggling as no people ever struggled before to keep out those people ineligible to become citizens and be naturalized. The people of California and many States have passed similar laws that these ineligible citizens can not come in under our laws. The Supreme Court of the United States has held that that act is valid and is not against the treaty; as that covers that. The Supreme Court has also used the language that it would be a dangerous thing to admit those people to obtain agricultural lands who were not subject to our laws, and who were not able to become citizens of the United States.

I want to say here that every man who has been opposing this law and has said that we would have trouble with Japan has made the same argument in regard to that question, and now who have appeared before the Supreme Court of the United States make the same argument they make in regard to the exclusion of those people who have been declared ineligible to become citizens of the United States.

Now, here is the story of a century. Look at this chart. Here is a graphic presentation of the past, present, and future of Hawaiians disappearing. Japanese already risen to predominance, and whites in hopeless minority.

You will see here demonstrated that in 1900 there were 23,400 Hawaiians. Look at the line coming down and you will see that there are now 23,723 Hawaiians on the Hawaiian Islands.

Now look again; Hawaiians, 18,000. For awhile there were many others, but they pushed them out.

With the gentleman's agreement that there was to be no increase in the Japanese population in the islands or the possessions of the United States or in continental United States, starting in 1880 down to 1900 they got very few, and they ran up until there was 100,374 Japanese in the Hawaiian Islands. I visited the schools of the Hawaiian Islands, one where the teacher told me there were over a thousand pupils present. So believe me, there were not over six white people attending that school. Anybody knows that within the last 10 years with those born in Hawaii they can dominate everything in

the island of Hawaii and elect all the officers. Then they say there is no danger in this increase of population.

These are from the census, and I will tell you another thing that I was unable to get into the Record and which I tried to prove. I talked with the immigration official. He told me that when the student goes out the native-born student, he registers as a Japanese. He gets a Japanese passport. When he comes into the country he comes in as an American citizen, and there is no record kept in regard to his entrance as a Japanese. Then people talk about an increase. There are 15,000 native Japanese in the Japanese schools, and when they come back they come in as American citizens, and they tell us that because there is not as large an increase because of this fact, there is no increase in the islands.

Let us take the map of continental United States—Japanese and Chinese population—continental United States, 1870 to 1920. In 1870, we had only 55 Japanese in continental United States. Follow the line up to 1880, 1890 up to 1900, and then it will be seen that between 1900 and 1907, when they were working on the gentleman's agreement that the Japanese population had increased tremendously. The Department of Labor has never seen this gentleman's agreement and we have their letter on file. No man has seen it except the Secretary of State and his officials. The committee members have seen them and the members of the delegation have been there, and I call attention again to the fact that even the treaty, with that postscript upon it, is still a secret document and among the secret files in the Senate, and I have the letter from the Secretary of the Senate within the last three weeks about that. They have never yet admitted the American people to see how, or why, or what was done when they adopted the treaty of 1911. While they were doing that, we find, coming to the United States during that period, over 20,000 Japanese, and then when they adopted the gentleman's agreement for about a year it will be noted that the invasion slackened. Since that time, up until 1920, we find that they have now over 116,000 and they have been coming in continually and are coming in today.

During that period from 1912 to 1915 there were over 20,000 Japanese picture brides who came to the United States, and I have here a list on one vessel. The Committee on Immigration saw them coming, from 50 to 100 in a vessel. In the year 1923 I saw the same thing with my own eyes in the Hawaiian Islands. I saw them landing over 60 picture brides at one time, and 50 others during the month of May and June of last year. They shut out the picture brides so far as the continental United States is concerned in 1920. Within the last week I received this paper from Tokyo itself and here is one family which runs up to about a hundred. There is a memorandum showing that before the picture-brides order was made in 1910—it took effect in 1920, in August—they began coming over as picture brides. The Japanese Government when a Japanese returned to Japan, made him enter the military service. They have abandoned that and they now give him from six months to a year, so that he goes home to Japan and gets his bride and brings her in. The Japanese Government encourages that and the steamship companies give him credit, so that it really does not cost him any more to go over and get his bride than to go and come back. Here is a list showing that there were some 50 in the last month. That is a paper that is published in Japan and a friend of mine sent it to me.

Every child born in the United States is an American citizen. They want to own the land. It is transferred to them immediately, and then they appoint a guardian. We have gone so far in California in order to save our own homes and have the western part of continental United States as to provide by law that a person ineligible to become a citizen of the United States can not be the guardian of his own child, for the purpose of preventing the Japanese and their Government from controlling the lands in that country. At one place in Placer County there were 25,000 acres of deciduous fruits growing there. They use the old mining ditches that brought water down in the early days for hydraulic purposes, and when the mining ceased they converted those into irrigation ditches for deciduous fruits.

One third of all of the deciduous fruits raised in California are raised there. Judge Fox saw it and Mr. Vane saw it. We took testimony in that locality. We saw where the white schools used to be, and we saw them abandoned. We saw where the American churches used to be, and we saw the windows knocked out and rotted. But in the Japanese colony we saw where they were occupying the land and running the country. In that year, 1920, over 10,000 acres of that land were under the domination and control and use of the Japanese in that one locality. That is the situation. We went through the State of Washington down through the valley between

Seattle and Tacoma, and we found in that wonderful valley over 50 per cent of the land in the control of the Japanese. We found that in the city of Seattle 47 per cent of every hotel in that great city was under the control and domination of the Japanese. We found the taxi cabs in Seattle under their domination and supervision. We found the vegetable markets under their control and supervision. We found banks and every other enterprise—barber shops, small stores, and others—under their domination and control. Go on down through California and down into Los Angeles, and the people there did the work themselves. We found that over 75 per cent of these occupations in these places are being controlled by these people, and then some people say that we do not have occasion to worry. As a boy I went to the normal school down near San Jose.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired. The entire night hours provided in the rule have now expired, and the time from now on is to be equally divided between the gentleman from Washington and the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Does the Chair hold that I can not ask unanimous consent—

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair holds that the gentleman has now yielded time. The time is now under the control of the gentleman from Washington and the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. BAKER).

Mr. BAKER. They had great orchards of almonds, peaches, and apricots. They had great fields of other work. In these days of 1883 and 1884 the American boy and the American high school and college girl assisted in doing this work. There were not any Chinese in the fields; there were not any Japanese in the fields. We go back 20 years and we find these boys and girls, driven from their places of employ. You know and I know that if Chinese or American girls would rather go hungry than work in the same field with a Chinaman or a Jap. The same way with the American boy.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAKER. I will.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Will the gentleman kindly make it clear to the House that the minority is with the majority on this proposition?

Mr. BAKER. I did, and I state this in fairness to all: This matter came up before the committee, and the committee unanimously voted in these provisions in this bill. (Applause.) So we have the united strength of the entire committee on that part of this bill. I took this time for this reason.

There has been considerable agitation and there has been some literature circulated in regard to this proposition that we were violating treaties, and now everybody yields and consents that we do not violate any treaty. The next question is as to the gentleman's agreement, which is not written, unknown, unrecorded, unratified, and above and beyond all of that my contention is in reading our Constitution, reading the decisions of our Supreme Court, the treaty-making power itself could not enter into a treaty and give a foreign country the control of who should come to the United States. (Applause.) If Congress itself, if every voice ever given it in the House and Senate, and the President should sign it, should pass a law yielding to a foreign country, as this gentleman's agreement does, to say that Japan should say who should come to our country, it is against our Constitution; it is against our very sovereignty, and can not be done. (Applause.) Now the only point that we desire is that this matter might be fully and fairly presented to the House, so that we might get in position here that the gentleman's agreement is not to operate any longer, and that the statutes of Congress may control, and that our officials may determine who shall come to the United States. The immigration officers hold up their hands when you ask them, "Why do you not exclude these persons?" They have not a word to say. When a Japanese comes to our shores and presents a passport, and he is admissible, we can not exclude him unless he is declared. Now, the dignity and honor and stability of our country demand that all the other nations of the earth should go with our sovereignty as a Nation. And we must see that our nation we have been good and kind to, and we have a high regard for their people and their civilization, but we want them to stay where they are. They said there would be war when we kept these grown men from sitting side by side with our little girls in school, they said war and the breaking of friendly relations would come when we raised the alien land laws, when we said our territories could not be used by an alien race of whom we could not make citizens—but the legislature took its usual,

even course and the cases went into the courts, and from the lower courts to the Supreme Court of the United States, and the best brain and ability the Japanese could muster and bring together there argued and struggled, and the Supreme Court without a dissenting voice held in five cases, one from the State of Washington and four from the State of California, first, that they had the right to pass the law and it was not against any treaty.

Second, that they could not even lease, they could not belong to a corporation of which the majority of stock was held by aliens; and next they could not even have a contract, because it affected the soil, and they have been working along in an evil way; and at the Washington President said, if Japan ever increased her population we can and will pass an exclusion law, and then the gentleman's agreement is wiped out. Now, I will just ask you to look at the map of Hawaii and then look at the map of continental United States.

Mr. ROX. I have here the words of the President.

Mr. BAKER. Will the gentleman read them?

Mr. ROX. I will read just that section:

I secured an agreement with Japan under which the Japanese themselves prevented any immigration to our country of their laboring people. It being distinctly understood that if there was such immigration the United States would at once pass an exclusion law.

Mr. BAKER. Yes. That is the part of the "gentleman's agreement" that was never put into the report of 1904. That is the part of the "gentleman's agreement" that everybody left out. That is the part of the "gentleman's agreement" that we are to be enforced. It was dictated by the great President Roosevelt, and nobody will complain nobody will object to our asserting our sovereign rights in such matters as this.

There is just one other thought that I wish to leave with the attention of the committee, and that is that we have been patient, we have done everything that has been within the human power of man to prevent any incursions of the law, believing in our Government, and believing that we would get legislation. We have secured it all except this, and there was sent here the other day by an organization from Los Angeles the statement that the American Legion refused to permit Japanese to build a church in Hollywood. These are great boys.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAKER. Yes.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. It is my recollection that when the Legislature of the State of California was considering the passage of a law relating to Japanese matters President Roosevelt asked the legislature not to pass that law, and later when one or both of these matters was up in California President Wilson sent Mr. Bryan, the Secretary of State, to California to intercede with the legislature not to pass it.

Mr. BAKER. Yes. I will refer to that. When President Roosevelt was in office we had a long telegram from him to this effect:

Be patient, gentlemen. We will have it adjusted, so that there will be no more need of legislation.

That was the "gentleman's agreement." Then you had Governor Johnson's administration in California, and this legislation was pending; and President Wilson, thinking that this thing could be disposed of and a dinner prepared to send Secretary Bryan out to California. Before Secretary Bryan left the Committee on Immigration had Secretary Bryan before it, on two several days, most of the forenoon, and he said it would be adjourned.

And without any session—far be it from me when we heard that Mr. Bryan was to leave Washington, I went to see the President a number of times, and I begged him to recall Mr. Bryan and not send him to California, because, as I said, "Just as sure as he goes, the legislature will pass that bill, irrespective of anything relating to the treaty." It was all right so far as the treaty was concerned. I think that answers it.

Mr. MILLER of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAKER. Yes.

Mr. MILLER of Washington. In order to satisfy some Members here, will the gentleman explain whether there is anything in this bill prohibiting immigration of Japanese to the Hawaiian Islands and the Philippines?

Mr. BAKER. It comes down off from the Hawaiian Islands.

Mr. MILLER of Washington. And from the Philippines?

Mr. BAKER. Yes; and from the Philippines. We except a certain class—Government officials, and so forth.

1924

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—HOUSE

5893

Now, one word in conclusion. The Supreme Court has said that the treaty of 1893 was a treaty of navigation and trade, and therefore we provide in this legislation that those who come to this country for the purpose of engaging in foreign trade are permitted to enter. So we will have no question about the treaty. We will admit those who come here to engage in trade, to interstate and foreign commerce, but we limit it, and the question will be settled, once and for all, to the satisfaction not only of the West but of the entire United States.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. Yes.

Mr. MAHON. If their children are born here, of course they will become Americans?

Mr. RAKER. I will answer that by saying they become Americans by virtue of the Constitution, but God knows they will never become Americans at heart, no matter how long they may live.

Mr. MAHON. I mean literally.

Mr. RAKER. Yes; literally, I say. I want to thank the House for its courtesy. [Applause.]

Mr. BAHATE. Mr. Chairman, I desire to take five minutes for the purpose of making clear to the House that the minority of two gentlemen, realizing that the four members of the subcommittee who have sponsored this provision are from that part of our country confronted with the Japanese situation, and were better informed as to the conditions than we, we of the majority have agreed to their view. Therefore there is no question as to the Japanese and Chinese proposition today.

I also wish to say, in connection with a statement that has been made here as to foreign parents, that one of the minority has recent information on the part of any foreign nation or any foreign people. Unfortunately some of the Members are sometimes under the impression that because people who are born here have foreign names, that they are foreigners. That is not true. These people, though of foreign parentage, and those naturalized here, under the Constitution, the same rights and the same privileges, I believe, as American citizens whose parents might have been born of so-called Nordic parents.

Now, as to the picture brides I wish to state that my colleague (Mr. BAKER) and the rest of the Members worked hard, and I have conferred with them, to eliminate that practice, and am under a plan that it has been eliminated. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I yield ten minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. ALDRICH). [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Rhode Island is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, in speaking against this bill I desire to make it clear that my objection is not to the administrative features of the bill, but to that provision which limits the number of quota immigrants who can enter this country in any one year to 100 and 2 per cent of the number of foreign-born individuals of a particular nationality residing in the United States as determined by the census of 1890, instead of using the census of 1910 as the quota base. The administrative features are, for the most part, a great improvement over those contained in the present law, and that part of the bill which grants exemption in favor of parents, husbands, and wives, and children is especially commendable from a humanitarian standpoint. I recognize the importance of some restriction upon immigration at least until the present disturbed economic conditions of the world have quieted down and until this country has had an opportunity to make completely assimilate those people who have already taken up their residence among us. But I believe that this should be done according to American principles and without discrimination against the nationals of any country or group of countries.

The principal argument of the committee in its report in favor of universal restriction of immigration is that we should prevent foreigners from coming into our country faster than we are able to assimilate and Americanize them, and at the same time they present a bill which will have the effect of slowing up the Americanization of those nationals of foreign countries who are already among us. It is my opinion that this bill, in so far as it discriminates against the nationals of the countries of southern Europe by taking the census of 1890 as a basis for the quotas to be admitted, falls completely in its avowed purpose of Americanizing our foreign-born population. We told the immigrant when he arrives upon our shores that you shall have arrived in a land of liberty and equal opportunity where all people are treated alike and without discrimination. It is asked to live under a Constitution based upon these principles. He is taught the evils of class legislation, and he

is rightly looked down upon if he does not enter into the spirit of our institutions.

We expect him to become a thorough American citizen, and now by the provisions of section 10 of this bill we are attempting to put into the law a provision which sets to a very large group of these people, who are already naturalized or about to become so, that we do not consider you particularly good citizens and are, therefore, materially reducing the number of your kind that may come into this country hereafter.

It must be apparent to every thoughtful Member of this House that this is the worst kind of discrimination against a large class of individuals and absolutely opposed to our American ideas of equality and justice. It is not also apparent that a law of this kind will not have the effect of Americanizing our foreign-born more rapidly but, on the contrary, will have the opposite effect and cause them to doubt our sincerity, to lose faith in the fairness of our Government, and to lose their desire to become loyal American citizens. In discussing the reasons for limiting admission of quota immigrants to 2 per cent of our foreign-born population based on the census of 1890, instead of 2 per cent based on the census of 1910, the committee said in its original report:

As touching reason for the change is that it is desired to slow down the stream of the types of immigrants which are not easily assimilated. Naturalization does not necessarily mean assimilation. The naturalization process has not worked well with the continued arrival in large numbers of the so-called new immigration. The new type crowds in the larger cities. It is rapidly losing but a slight knowledge of America and American institutions. It has given to be a most undisciplined mass of alien thought, aims, and purposes. It is a menace to the social, political, and economic life of the country. It creates alien and apprehension. It breeds racial hatreds, which should not exist in the United States and which need not exist when the balance shall have been restored.

Does not this statement show that the committee has taken upon itself to decide that the nationals of certain European countries are undesirable citizens, and has it not practically limited all the people from those countries living in the United States, whether they are American citizens or not? It is true that they decline this intention in rather apologetic and unconvincing language on page 17, where they say:

Our citizens do not speak of any type of people as actually undesirable. Nevertheless the slow of assimilation is noted. The undesirable are the criminals, the beggars, the paupers, and the other classes excluded by section 3 of the act of 1911.

In the later majority report they modify their language somewhat, but the fact remains they have made very serious assertions against the nationals of these countries; and this is hardly the way to encourage the Americanization of these nationals. Discrimination against those already here does much more to "breed racial hatreds" than anything else. If we desire assimilation, we must treat all alike.

There is another reason advanced for limiting immigration numerically, and that is to protect our own workmen from abnormal competition from foreign countries; for example, when there is a general industrial depression in foreign countries, such as exists in some European countries today, there are likely to come into our country unusually large numbers of foreign laborers—a great many of them coming for a short time only, who come here for the purpose of making a living in competition with our own people, with the result that the standard of living of our own workers, who have built up this country, is temporarily, if not permanently, impaired by this abnormal competition. The committee has not discussed this phase of the question, and I simply call attention to it, as I believe it is the reason why a large number of national organizations have filed petitions with the committee registering their approval of this bill. I believe their reasoning is sound, but they are not interested in the question whether we adopt the census of 1890 or the census of 1910 as the basis of figuring the quotas, but favor some limitation on immigration and to derive the Johnson bill, as it is the only immigration bill before the House.

Now, let us see who the people are that are discriminated against by this bill. I happen to come from a State which has next to the largest foreign-born population of any State in the Union. Twenty-eight and one-half per cent of our total population is foreign born and probably about one-half of the population is foreign born or born of foreign parents. As a result I have had an opportunity to observe intimately the Americanization of our foreign-born population and what they have done in the way of becoming assimilated and how they have adapted themselves to our industrial, social, and political life. One of the countries which would be most severely dis-

estimated another by going back to the census of 1890 for one quota basis in Italy. Under the present law 42,937 Italians are admitted each year. Under the proposed law this number would be cut to 4,000. What is true of the Italians, I think, is also true to a very great extent of the nationals of the other countries of southern Europe; but let us take the Italians as an example, and I shall speak of them as Italians for the sake of brevity, although a large part of them are Americans of Italian descent.

Industrially the Italians of our State have been extremely successful, and this is noteworthy when we consider the fact that a large number of them were unskilled laborers when they first arrived in this country. They are thrifty and a great many of them have acquired their own homes. Some have farms, and even those who have not are extremely skillful in raising agricultural products upon the lands which they possess, or on small gardens around their houses. They do not confine their efforts to any one line of industry. They work on our farms, in our mills, and in our stores. We have successful Italian farmers, bankers, lawyers, doctors, and business men, and many of them rank at the top of their respective businesses or professions, having worked their way up from humble beginnings. For instance, one of the Justices of our superior court was born in Italy, having come to Rhode Island in his youth, and because of his remarkable ability was chosen for the position he now holds.

Those Italians who have lived among us for a number of years have proved by their interest and activities in civic affairs that they are rapidly becoming completely Americanized and have adopted our social customs. They take an interest in the development of our institutions and charities. Whenever there is an effort made to raise funds for building hospitals or supporting charitable institutions the Italians always do their part, and do it cheerfully and energetically.

In regard to the political tendencies of the Americans of Italian descent and also the nationals of the other southern European nations there is a popular impression that they are inclined to be radical, but an examination of the citizens in Rhode Island, where we have a large percentage of these people in any State in the Union, shows this to be untrue. For example, at the last election for governor in Rhode Island there were less than 1,000 votes cast for the socialist candidate. The New England States are traditionally conservative, and the large increase of foreign population during recent years has done nothing toward destroying this traditional conservatism. The Italians are becoming naturalized rapidly and are making a deep and active interest in our political affairs. In the city of Providence two members of the board of aldermen and several members of the common council are of Italian descent. Several members of our State legislature and an assistant attorney general are also of Italian extraction. An examination of the votes of these members of the various political bodies there is nothing to indicate that they are radical, and there is nothing to indicate that they are influenced by any racial considerations, but vote according to what they consider to be the best interest of the country and of the State of Rhode Island.

If we compare the radicalism existing in Rhode Island, where 28 per cent of our population is foreign born and favors from those countries against which this bill would discriminate, with some of the Western States, where the foreign born population is made up largely of Nordic races, I think that we will find that there is much less radicalism in Rhode Island than there is in these Western States.

The record of American soldiers of Italian parentage during the war has already been called to our attention on the floor of this House, and I simply wish to add that what has been said of them is borne out by the opinion of a friend of mine who, as a colonel during the World War, commanded a regiment which contained a large number of these soldiers from Rhode Island, and he speaks of them as extremely brave and efficient.

Furthermore, let us not forget what men like Dante, Michael Angelo, Leonardo Da Vinci, Verdi, Galileo, Marconi, and innumerable other illustrious Italians have contributed to literature, art, music, and science. Should we hesitate to welcome the descendants of these men to our citizenship? Are they not likely to contribute something of value to our country and our civilization?

If we adopt the census of 1890 as the basis for the quotas to be admitted under our immigration law, we will greatly discriminate against the nationals of Italy and the other countries of southern Europe. If we amend this bill and retain the census of 1910 as our quota basis, we avoid this discrimination and we will have an opportunity to enact an immigration

law which will be fair and just to the nationals of all countries and which will not offend any of our citizens. Whether our ancestors were born in northern or southern Europe or elsewhere where we have all done our share in building up this great country of ours, and we are entitled to equal consideration in the framing of its laws, and I trust that the Members will keep this fact in mind in voting on the bill now before the House. [Applause.]

Mr. KATH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to my colleague from Illinois [Mr. KERR].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, let us be as generous in peace as we have been brave in battle. There seems to be a great deal of alarm among the Members of Congress and more so than there is amongst the people of this country. There seems to be a great deal of national hatred among some of the Members of Congress and I regret it very much. In the last year or two since I have been a Member of Congress, I have observed it. I remember a year or two ago that I attended the Army and Navy game. I rose in my seat, with some of my friends from Chicago, and a Congressman from the State of Tennessee was asked who I was, and he stated I was a Polish Jew.

Now, gentlemen, if I were a Polish Jew I would be proud of it, because I believe the same man that shines upon the shades upon that gentleman, that the very star which enlightened him enlightened me, and there is no difference between him and me; that the same Lord and Creator created him who created me, and I believe when the day of judgment comes he will be judged as I will be judged, whether he belongs to one creed or another, whether he worships in one church and I in another. It will not be a question as to the church in which he worships, but the question will be, What have you done for humanity, and what kind of a man have you been during your time of life? [Applause.]

I was very much impressed when I heard the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. McHenry] mention Gen. Andrew Jackson, a name so eminently known in history, one who led an army of men through the hills and valleys of Tennessee and through the swamps and bayous of Louisiana during the War of 1812.

It put me back to my days of youth, when history recited that in 1778 not only did the Anglo-Saxons fight for the liberty of this country—who were here and had to defend their rights—but history tells us that in 1778 Kosciuszko, Poleski with a Polish army, Lafayette (France), Rochambeau, and others came to this country, not to defend them, but to defend the rights of the people, to defend the honor of liberty, to defend a name for those who were persecuted and those who desired to live under the banner of freedom and liberty. General Poleski fell in battle at Savannah, Ga.

I read in the Appendix only yesterday where my worthy colleague of West Virginia [Mr. ALLEN] stated that in some Jersey town some foreign paper had published the fact that a Polish judge was elected.

That must be a crime, I do not know whether it is a felony or whether it is a crime against the Constitution of this country. I remember when in the city of Chicago, which is known to be a cosmopolitan city, Frederick A. Busse was elected mayor of Chicago in the Republican ticket by an overwhelming majority, and I remember reading in the German papers where they took pride in the fact that Fred Busse was a German and the headline was "Busse, one of our Germans, elected mayor of Chicago." There was no crime in that. When President Harding appointed Mr. Davis as Secretary of Labor, I have heard it said by a great many Germans who took pride in the fact that Mr. Davis, one of the Weidmen in this country, was appointed in the President's Cabinet, and there was no crime in that. In every locality, in a great country like ours, the melting pot of the world, where the people of every nation come to better themselves, we find instances of that kind. Why, gentlemen, it ought to be a lesson to us. When we go back to Germany we find that after the partition of Poland, Poles, Danes, and Germans tried to Germanize Germany. Those Poles who were partitioned and cast into Germany were prevented from using their language. Their schools were closed and they were forced to use the German language. They being God-fearing and law-abiding, abided by the law, but when opportunity was offered them they took arms with the Allies against their persecutors.

Mr. VAILE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KERR. Yes, sir.

Mr. VAILE. As the gentleman has remarked on the floor here this is a very important subject, and while I do not care to raise the point of no quorum, as the gentleman did the other

day, I am sorry the gentleman has not a quorum present to hear his remarks.

Mr. KUNZ. Well, I wish there was a quorum present. If the gentleman raises the point, I will be glad of it. Does the gentleman raise the point?

Mr. VALLE. No; I am a little more considerate than the gentleman was to be the other day when I was speaking.

Mr. KUNZ. I feel, Mr. Chairman, it is the duty of every Member of Congress on a question so vitally important to the people of this country, to be here in order to be thoroughly carried without prejudice as to the conditions about which we all are here.

I want to refer to the gentleman that in 1923 I visited Europe. Congressman Meyer, who is now dead, and myself spent 10 weeks in Europe studying the conditions of exploitation, and I am better versed than a great many men who are on the floor of this House and have taken up this bill for consideration. [Applauds.] The fact is I visited those countries and I did not need an interpreter to find out conditions, and I would like to tell you what happened there and the conditions as they are, but I have not the time. If I could have sufficient time it would be a great pleasure for me to tell you the conditions as they were.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KUNZ. Yes, sir.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. Could the gentleman give us any idea how many would come to this country if we did not have a quota law?

Mr. KUNZ. If the gentleman will give me the time I will be only too glad to describe the conditions as they were at that time.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. I have not control of the time.

Mr. KUNZ. If I had the time I would be only too glad to do it.

There has been a great deal of clapping among the Members of Congress in talking about bolshevism, about nihilism and about many other disturbances in this country, and it is all done in front of the American. I am not here protecting the foreigner. I am not American, just as good an American as there is upon the floor of this House and just as good an American as there is in this country, and I can prove my Americanism any time you wish while some of the other gentlemen probably can not.

When you talk about communism and nihilism, you say it is the foreigner that breeds it. Why, gentlemen, let me call your attention to some facts. You remember the I. W. W., do you not? You remember Mr. Debs and you remember Mr. Foster.

You remember that violent aggression. Were they of Southern Europe or were they Anglo-Saxons? Then you point your finger to one nation or another, the other. Why say to me, You shall enter the gates of heaven, and you shall enter the gates of hell. He who enters and we will pass judgment as to whether he is a qualification without one passing judgment upon people of that kind. [Applauds.]

In August, 1923, I was in Berlin. I was there while the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations was in London, England. I was in Munich and talked to the minister of Germany. I was in Berlin and met every German official in that country. I was in Stuttgart, Pfullen. I was in Weimar, Weimar. I was in the office of the consul of America there when I saw 1,000 refugees from Russia waiting to have their passports issued to come to America. In every country that I visited there were people who were waiting anxiously to come to this country, and while I was in Munich talking to the minister of Germany, Von Kautz, with Congressman Meyer, who is now dead, Mr. von Kautz said to Mr. Meyer and myself, "You gentlemen are both from America. Let me tell you that we have not been treated fairly or honestly by America. After the war and before the electric industries were put to the German people with the promise of helping out Germany, but after the election Mr. Harding washed his hands and said he wanted nothing to do with the reconstruction of Europe, but," he said, "except that three fifths of the population of America is German, and we will send a propaganda to America before the next election that will compel the American Congress to give the Germans aid."

At that time I paid very little heed to it; but only a few days ago our American Congress passed a measure, and while I was on the measure because I believe there is a great deal of suffering there, yet our American Congress appropriated \$10,000,000 to help the suffering Germans.

Now, you might say to me, "Well, they need it." I want to say to you in return, a short year or two ago, that I have visited a place in Germany where there was not a house or a building where you did not have to reserve your seat

three days in advance. There was not a public restaurant that was not crowded, and in the hotels when you registered as an American you had to pay 4,500 marks a day for a room where a native European would come in and receive the same accommodations for 1,000 marks. Of course, we were in the hotel where there were a great many people; Germans mixed with all other nations. I want to say that I talked with a great many Germans and they said that if it was not for President Wilson Germany would not be in the position it is, and they were only waiting the time when Germany would come back on its feet and be where it was before the war.

Now, gentlemen, there is no question in my mind but that Germany will be back on its feet. There is no question but that we desire to be friends with Germany, but I want to call the attention of the chairman of the Committee on Labor and Members so deeply interested in this bill to the fact that you are discriminating against other nations. As the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. Tamm) said, the 1920 census would give southern Europe two times more than they have now.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. KUNZ. I yield to the gentleman five minutes more.

Mr. KUNZ. What difference would it make how many there were any nation would get if it was an honest deal? Do you intend to give Germany more? You know that in the last war we fought Germany utterly and I have the courage to tell you, in spite of the German language, I speak as an American to you and stand to you as an American. With what Von Kautz told me and Mr. Meyer, that they would send propaganda to this country because thousands of years German; under your bill you had approximately 20,000, which will strengthen the Germans, and finally you will be run by the German element and not by the Anglo-Saxon and those from southern Europe.

According to your census figures under the 1910 census Germany created 45,000; under the 1920 they received 85,000; and under the 1930, 50,000. It makes no difference to me what figure you give in Germany, whether you give 50,000 or 200,000; if they are justly entitled to 100,000, if it is just according to the census of 1920, I would say give it to them, but you are trying to discriminate in favor back to the census of 1890 against other nations, and then you object that it is this question that they are inferior.

The American people have just emerged from the thick darkness of national distress, and emerged as no other nation could reasonably have expected to from such dangers—triumphant, though bleeding at every pore. The first impulse of a great people on being delivered from imminent peril is that of joy and thanksgiving. Then comes gratitude for those by whose beneficence, under the guidance of the Almighty, safety has been attained; then a sad reflection upon the fearful sacrifices by which success has been purchased and a bitter recollection of those who have fallen in the strife; and finally the composed mind gathers up the teachings of such a fearful experience—wisdom for the guidance of future years.

On the surrender of Germany and Austria, when the armistice was signed, our people gave themselves up to the wildest rejoicings. For a time the toils, the trials, the sorrows of five dreadful years were all forgotten. Business places were closed, our people rushed out of doors, impromptu parades filled the streets with all nationalities participating. Music led our exultant emotions as far as musical sounds could comfort them. Bands played, whistles blew, bells rang, and the shoutings of the multitude took up the joyful strains and bore them in triumph to the skies. Our people are fond of exultation and may be aroused to enthusiasm upon slight provocation. But then the grounds for national rejoicing were adequate and philosophical. Such dangers as had threatened our Government had been averted; such dangers as the world had never seen before had been suppressed; such results as had never before been accomplished by war had been achieved. We plunged into the war unprepared, and in millions of our fellow men across the sea. We came forth a nation of free men no longer recognizing any distinction of nationalities or creed. Our Republic had successfully ended the experiment of its existence and took its place a full, round, high place—first among the powers of the earth. We had to thank the Almighty after the storms of war had passed that we had come out of the terrible conflict with the knowledge that we had fought for the right and had upheld the traditions of our fathers. [Applauds.]

The brother love of man, the absolute equal rights of all men, the right of all to participate in the privileges and benefits of civil government, as they share its burdens, although to our minds familiar and self-evident truths, have dawned gradually

upon the earth and made their way slowly into the creeds of men. The Jew denied to everyone not a Jew not only the rights of citizenship in temporality but all hope of enjoying the blessings of heaven.

The gentle might indeed be adopted into the Jewish Commonwealth, but as gentle he was in nothing. When Pericles boasted that in Athens all men enjoyed equal privileges and were perfect for their merits and not for their birth, he spoke in a city of which no inconsiderable portion of its inhabitants were slaves. By all men, he meant all Athenians; he did not recognize that any but Athenians were men. Jesus first burnt the leaders of national selfishness. He came to establish a Kingdom that should know no end; to be united with the destinies of no nations which should survive all and supersede all, and its foundations were laid heavily secondarily. The Jew, the gentile, the Scythian, the barbarian, the bond, the free, the black, and the white were invited to share equal benefits in His Kingdom. His first taught principles found enough to include without discrimination all nations, races, and colors in a common benefit.

The Declaration of Independence, the earlier stone of our nationality, was man's first attempt to introduce the liberal principles of Christian faith into the framework of civil government. It was a declaration, not that all Americans, all Englishmen, all Frenchmen were equal, but that all men were equal, no matter where born, no matter whether educated or ignorant, rich or poor, black or white. It declared the right to equality before the law, the right to participate in civil government, not from the accident of birth or condition, nor yet from race or color, but from the fact of manhood alone. [Applause.]

Upon this principle, as the one great faith of our people, the great we intended to realize, the constitution to the development of which we pledged ourselves, our fathers appealing to the God of battles and succeeded. A more solemn covenant was never entered into between a nation and the God of nations. Upon this principle we moved through years of bloody wars against some of the most powerful nations of the world. Without an army, without a navy, without an echelon we stood and withstood all the power of England, because the truth will always stand and right triumph over wrong while God sits on the throne of the universe.

Thousands of brave young men, without discrimination, left our shores to suppress war, with the Declaration of Independence in their minds—embodying liberty, freedom, and equality to all men—slain in bloody graves across the seas, while thousands above their graves, bearing foreign honorable names, yet living in our homes and grateful memories. Their example should appeal to our manhood and our conscience.

They hoped to carry our Government through a crisis in its existence; they strove to establish it firmly upon immutable truth and to give it the noblest opportunity a nation ever had to benefit mankind. It now devolves upon us who survive to determine whether their lives were laid down in vain and in no way. I venture can be so truly honor them as in studying well and performing faithfully the duty they have hoped to save from us. If we prove equal to our opportunity; if we stand for justice and for equality among men; if we keep the lamp of liberty trimmed and burning and allow its light to shine from our altars throughout the world, we honor them; they have not died in vain. Therefore it seems to be appropriate to inquire into our duties to the best of our ability and give ourselves for their performance. They died for others, not for themselves. Therefore let us so live as to exert the influence of the exalted position that has been conferred upon us for the welfare of mankind and not for the attainment of selfish ends.

The policy of our Government as expressed by the act which was passed in Congress in 1907 for a restrictive selective immigration measure has been to welcome to our shores all foreigners who are desirable, namely, those who are mentally, physically, and morally sound and friendly to our form of government. We are all the extract of the foreigners and the only question is, when did our forefathers reach the shores of this land of promise and freedom? Those people born here of foreign parents and those born in foreign countries comprise one-third of the entire population of this great Nation, and 50 per cent of the recent immigration constitutes the young men and women of to-day's laboring classes, so necessary to our industrial prosperity. We are in need of both skilled and unskilled laborers, also domestic help, but this bill tends to keep out that class of immigrants best suited for such occupations. Under the provisions of the bill now under consideration it would not bring into this coun-

try a better class or a more assimilable body of immigrants than have come under the present law. This bill goes further than the present law in fixing an arbitrary number of immigrants than can be admitted. It is the purpose of this bill to embody our permanent policy of immigration and bind us to a program which will be inflexible, unscientific, and unjust; and furthermore, it is an attempt to treat a human problem upon a cold mathematical formula, since it is based on quantity rather than quality.

The present bill is particularly objectionable because it discriminates against certain nationalities already going to make up a great portion of our population and form the fabric of racial, religious, and national hatreds and brands forever those already here as an inferior stock. It discriminates against Poland, the home of culture and art and literature, from whence came Copernicus, the astronomer; two of our Revolutionary heroes, Thaddeus Kosciuszko, who history tells us planned the defense of West Point and whose statue stands on the West Point parade grounds; and Kasimir Pulaski, who died on the battle field at Savannah, Ga., fighting for the freedom of these United States of America. Both of these heroes of Polish birth have been honored with statues and monuments in the Capital of our Nation and in several of the States. America has a strong artistic bond with Poland in the memory of Helena Modjeska, the tragedienne; in the memory of Chopin, the composer; Adam Mickiewicz, the poet. This bill discriminates against the Poles, who have volunteered their services in the late World War, and who, when opportunity was offered by our Congress have taken the oath of allegiance to fight for the Stars and Stripes and the freedom of the world against their land of birth. It discriminates against Italy, from whence came the discoverer of this great continent, and to whom the world owes a great debt. It discriminates against France from whence came the immortal Lafayette and Rochambeau, both defenders in our great cause for freedom and liberty. Have we so soon forgotten the World War when the soldier was a hero, when the youth of these same nationalities residing in the United States joined hands with their relatives across the seas and brought victory to us and our allies in that great conflict? Shall we exclude these contributions in arms, now claiming them to be inferior, by a mere mathematical formula? Is it fair? Is it American? Is it within the meaning of the Declaration of Independence of this great Nation? Statistics show that over 400,000 foreigners—that is, of immediate foreign extraction and foreign born—enlisted in the military forces of this country and when Congress passed the special act granting the privilege to become citizens to aliens having served in the armed forces, living in the United States two years, approximately 500,000 took advantage of this privilege. At that time no cry was raised against the foreigner, many of whom were of Polish ancestry, born in Germany, Austria, and Russia, and who took up arms against their land of birth in 1901 for the principles and ideals of their adopted country. Statistics also show that in the large cities, thickly populated by the foreign element, the sale of liberty bonds far overreached the quota.

That in itself shows the loyalty of the alien to his adopted country. However, there seems to be a determined effort to be as unfair as possible. In addition to reducing the percentage from 5 per cent, this bill takes as a basis census figures 50 years old, before the resurrection of Poland and the birth of Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, Latvia, and to forth, instead of taking the census of 1920 now available, or even the census of 1930, the basis of the present law. There is no provision in our Constitution as to seniority by birth or naturalization; once you become a citizen your rights are equal. Then why should we give preference to those of the 1850 census as against those who are here and have the same rights and privileges legislated this present date. This basis was deliberately selected to favor the so-called Nordic race and to discriminate against the races of southern and eastern Europe, which discrimination is a perfidious doctrine for democratic America, founded upon the Declaration of Independence that all men are created equal. I believe that there have come from the Nordic race, gods as it is, those whom they would not recognize as their children; and so with other countries celebrated for the noble characteristics of their race as a whole.

Our country is still large enough geographically, politically, and socially to receive those immigrants seeking at our doors, whether of brain or brawn, who answer our moral, mental, and physical requirements; and who can contribute to our art, our science, our literature, our commerce, and our industry. We have acres enough, industries enough, mechanics, and natural resources enough, and sources of credit enough to make out of

this Nation the greatest nation on earth under our Constitution which gives us freedom and under our self-government, under which it has to the and growth.

I realize the force of what has been said here by several gentlemen who are supporting the bill that the first and the main obligation of an American, especially a Member of Congress, is to look out for the welfare of the American people. If the admission of immigrants to this country, however it might ease conditions in Europe, would in the slightest degree imperil or thereby the safety of our institutions but the prospects of employment for our own laborers, or of the prosperity of the American people as a whole, I would advocate not only restricting immigration but prohibiting it. Just because I believe the immigrant who cultivates our soil contributes to the welfare of the country as much, if not more, than he derives from it, I am opposed to discriminatorily restricting a force of benefit so important to our country.

Our most developed industrial States are those which have had the largest immigration. Our most backward States, industrially, are those which have had no immigration to speak of. The extraordinary and unprecedented growth of the United States is undoubtedly due to the effect of immigration. The States of the South pride themselves on keeping the foreigner from their territory, and yet it is a fact that their industrial progress has been slow. A new feature, new elements, those States. The boom, to the number of 300,000, has migrated to the North to fill the places in factories, street cars, and domestic places that have formerly been filled by the immigrant. This migration of the negro can only mean a decrease in the population of the South, which will have the effect of reducing the representation of the South in Congress.

The proponents of this bill repeat the exploded theory that there have been two periods of immigration—the good period before 1880 and the bad period since that time. The strange feature in our history is that the greatest progress we have made in industry, in science, and even in the last war, where no question was raised as to nationality, and even those fought, whether he happened to be a foreigner or an American, for the preservation of our institutions and the freedom of the entire world, has occurred since 1880. Immigration yields the insurmountable advantage of affording means by which the skilled labor of the country can be employed. It is true in some respects that the foreign laborer does displace the American laborer, but he displaces him by lifting him on his shoulders up to a higher plane of employment, where his wages are higher, his hours of labor shorter, and his conditions immeasurably improved.

The claim that there has been a great influx of foreigners to our country since the war by the proponents of this bill is completely in error. For instance, take the year 1923. The total immigration for that year was 522,819—215,381 female immigrants and 307,438 male immigrants, of which 46,241 were under 16 years of age. During the year of 1923 statistics show that 51,400 aliens left the United States and returned to their native countries. During that year 117,013 Canadians and 63,783 Mexicans crossed our borders and were classed as nonquota immigrants. I for one, Mr. Chairman, believe that if we are to have a restrictive measure it should also apply to these bordering countries. These people do not come into this country to become citizens, but only to accumulate wealth and return to enjoy the fruits of their labor in their native country.

For the welfare of the American laborer, for the prosperity of our country, for the safety of our Government, for the welfare of humanity, and for the progress and peace of the world, I believe this bill should be amended, striking out the discriminating feature and the 1580 census. The real question before the American people is to keep the undesirable out of this country. Even under the discriminating limitations of this bill as of the 1890 census, it will permit the entry of a great many friends and relatives of those against whom charges have been brought as being disloyal to this country. We will find in most cases where a man is opposed to the institutions of our country that he does not voluntarily take the oath of allegiance and is anxious to go to his place. It is he who breeds anarchy and bolshevism, being infected with that idea before he arrives on account of the conditions in the country from whence he came. Every effort was made to threaten the spirit of anarchy, birth, and anarchy. My remedy would be that instead of permitting a certain percentage of any census of foreign born that we amend the bill to read "quota of foreign-born naturalized citizens," which would decrease the number under the present quota and permit bringing into this country relatives of citizens only who have been loyal to our

Nation. We have in the United States a large number of foreign-born aliens who have voluntarily accepted their duty in becoming citizens and who to-day, on account of the progress they have made, are anxious to bring their relatives to this country so that they may benefit by the prosperity of our country. But if this law was limited to citizenship alone we would keep away those who come here for profit and to carry away our money.

We stand upon the broad platform of the Declaration of Independence that—

All men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

We say that these rights are not given by laws, they are not given by the Constitution, but they are the gift of God, given to every man born in the world. Oh, sir, how glorious is this great principle compared with the human—I might say the heathenish—appeal to the prejudice of race against race; the endeavor further to excite the strong against the weak; the endeavor further to deprive the weak of their rights of protection against the strong. God never made a man for the sake of making him nor that he might amass wealth and corrupt himself with its enjoyment.

Every man is sent into this world with certain qualities to be cultivated and developed; charged with duties to be performed and clothed with responsibilities commensurate with his power, sent into the world that some other may be better for his having lived and then say, do you believe God had no part, no design in all these wonderful events? He saw the end from the beginning, and the beginning would not have been if the end had not been intended. It is true that the love of liberty and freedom in their hearts, the critical condition of their countries, their fleeing to those shores, their founding of a free commonwealth, their growth in education and power as a people are all natural events.

The result of my observations thus made is that there is nothing to be more dreaded in this country than feuds arising from exaggerated feelings of religion and nationality. On the other hand, the one thing needed for making our country the happiest of nations is to rub down all sharp angles and to remove those separation which divide our people on questions of creed and religious profession. The man who says this can not be done consistently with any set of principles founded on the charity of the gospel or on the right use of human reason is a "know-nothing," as every right let, while under the influence of his bigotry he sees no further than his nose. For a man who has grown to years of discretion, though some never so come to those years—who has not become wedded to one idea, who like mine are ready to regulate their conduct so as to let their watch when the church clock declares it wrong; who is ready to be taught by him as well as by his law and to receive any stamp of truth—I may say that such a man may come to this conclusion: That there are in all origins, races, and religions men good, bad, and indifferent; yet for my part my experience has been that in all classes the good predominate. (Applause.)

Mr. WITTER of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I have strongly favored the admission of a bona fide class of aliens, as defined in section 4 of this bill. For it should appeal to the fair-minded man that the man who has come here with the fixed purpose to establish a home and become a citizen, who has lived up to that purpose, who has become a citizen, and who, by his industry and frugality, has accomplished that worthy achievement—the establishment of a home—is entitled to and should be permitted to have admitted his wife and minor children to share in the enjoyment of that home. For has he not proven beyond question that he is a highly desirable citizen, and it is highly desirable to him, to his family, and to the public welfare that in all such instances the home circle should be preserved and preserved.

For it is well approved that upon the integrity and prosperity of the American home rests the strength and through it is guaranteed the perpetuity of the social structure. It may further be said with absolute confidence the record of such a man furnishes the very best proof that those for whom he seeks admission will not become a public charge. He is here, we have ascertained that he has made good; and the condition of his immediate family carries with it the very minimum of risk for society and the Government.

I believe the sentiment in favor of limitation of immigration by a strong restrictive measure, be almost unanimous. The necessity for such a measure must be apparent to every thoughtful American.

More and more is the welfare of America bound up in the solution of this problem. The statement of Chairman Dwyer in the House of April 5 calling attention to the vast number of applications for passports and visas by persons in Russia, resulting in immorality in crime to their relatives in the United States, and his further statement that the reports that there are now in Warsaw 70,000 people trying to get to the United States are true, has been questioned, but has not been disproven. And the very fact that many refugees are temporarily domiciled in the countries on the western border of Russia, waiting to come here, temporarily domiciled, because those adjacent countries will not receive them as permanent residents, proves that those countries, in their own best interests, are now pursuing a policy more drastic than is proposed in this bill. And in further support of the chairman's statement, I desire to here call the attention of this House to the statement of Mr. Nathan Grosshandler, of Youngstown, Ohio, a native of Hungary and a citizen of the United States for 12 years, a publisher of recent newspapers, two of them foreign language—Hungarian and Slavic. His testimony gave evidence throughout of his intense Americanism.

Even the gentleman from Illinois could not, nor has he in the employment of his expressive, eloquently portrayed a higher type. The witness said he had traveled in 14 countries in northeastern Europe as a student of economic, financial, and industrial conditions, and had this to say when interrogated by the subject of war—“the prevalence of the crime of the people of those countries to come to America.” I quote:

“Knowledge of the prevalence of the crime that prevails in Europe to-day, I might as well say to you honestly, you are a hundred times if ten times as much to come to America, and to cut off the 100,000 people will be that they want to come to America. Those are the conditions.”

It would seem superfluous to pursue further the argument to prove this condition, but I have introduced one more quotation from Mr. Grosshandler's testimony:

“Mr. Dwyer of Ohio is a member of the committee. How many people can you not find evidence?”

“Mr. Grosshandler. I have asked that question by the thousands.”

“Mr. Dwyer. When you were in Europe?”

“Answer. Yes, sir.”

“Mr. Dwyer. And if we did not, have the 100,000 cut off, will you admit that?”

“New York the language of the witness:—
“Answer. I believe, of course, I will be honest with you, if the doors were open and you asked just as you have, if the doors could open, then they would come here by the millions.”

And to be perfectly fair with the witness, his affirmation stated it would take a year, four years to earn money to pay his passage in America.

A carpenter in Budapest earns \$2.00 a week, or 50 cents in American money. In the United States from 50 to 400, and the proceeds of one day's labor for a mechanic in the United States will compare favorably to ten times as much from an Hungarian. That is the main reason they are pressing to come to this shore.

COMPARISON OF THE LAW

We have already decided by law that this country shall not be the dumping ground of undesirable elements of foreign population from whatever source they may seek to enter.

It can not be reasonably expected that foreign governments will have a great care for the interests or rights in this respect. Indeed, reliable statistics prove beyond question that there have been grave and serious abuses in this particular, whether with the connivance of foreign governments I do not pretend to say. But every loyal American admits the happy-go-lucky policy of the criminal enforcement of the provision of law in relation to this subject.

I have believed and have spoken before to-day for the strict enforcement of the law, and the increasing laxity of the law's administration. I have always been in favor of some flexibility in administration as against from rigidity. Certainly when we come to this point time in any case when a nation seems to be in the wrong we should not become too hard, although outside the conflict. For this reason I have not severely criticized the temporary amendments, under bond, of course, might otherwise of a strike about the first question. While strong criticisms have been directed against some sections of the law, the business I have favored a lax enforcement of the law, I have felt that the error has been on the side of a relaxation of humane sentiment.

I believe the present bill will eliminate any excuse for such laxity in the future. Now, as to whether there is unjust discrimination in the 1907 census as a basis of computation of quotas, the subject has been much discussed. Gentlemen who felt that it discriminated against certain nationalities have in-

stated that the people referred to have rendered great service to America in time of war and have contributed by their industry to her advancement in time of peace. This is true; and if except withheld from them no need of justice that is fairly theirs. And if that is a fair argument in their behalf, and if they who have been here so short a time have done well, and are entitled for that reason to be given a basis of admission more favorable for their former countrymen, as it then an unfair argument that the basic stock of America should be given commensurate consideration in the adjustment of this great problem, who have established the memory and the principles of those men who laid the foundation of civil and religious liberty in this country more than 200 years ago, principles which have found expression in our Constitution, a document which represented all the progress in government from the beginning of history until that good day. If it shall be true, is it strange that the millions of our population derived from that basic stock should believe because the principles enshrined in our organic law follow within their very souls, who think with veneration and contemplation with gratitude the names and public service of the men who promulgated that great document? It is strange that those millions who have borne the storms and trials of all the centuries should not at least as much consideration as those who have come at a later date?

It is a question for America to decide, and to decide in the light of her own best interest—not for to-day alone, not for this generation, but for America and posterity. [Applause.]

Mr. SADIATH. Mr. Chairman, I now stand to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. O'SULLIVAN].

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, if all the changes contemplated by the proposed immigration bill now appear with greater force than does that which abolishes the bounty of existing law whereby this Government, after an invitation to the immigrant, turn him back to his own country because the quota for his race is exhausted when he reaches our shores. I can conceive few things more cruel than having permitted those helpless immigrants to travel over the watery wastes, to combat their wanderings over the seas, tedious journey to their homeland. Such unfortunate instances should not occur as when, during the past year, a steamship arrived at New York with a number of immigrants on board who were threatened with deportation because the vessel had reached its destination a few minutes before the time when a new monthly quota would begin. A certificate granted by the American authorities in the foreign land should be a ticket of admission, and the immigrant should not be permitted to sail on a useless journey to this country unless he is to be admitted, providing of course, he can pass such tests as are here provided.

However, the main thought of the bill is its restrictive feature, and the weakness of its restrictive philosophy receives support from the fact which takes the result of 1907 as the basis upon which the various quotas are to be computed. This will cause an extraordinary change in the present immigration law, which is based on the census of 1910 for quota computation. The following table of figures will best explain what this proposed change involves:

	Immigrants Classified per cent 1907	Per cent 1907
Albion	285	4
Austria	100	12
Belgium	2,447	1,000
Bulgaria	2,283	1,000
Canada	1,000	1,000
China	14,507	2,000
Czechoslovakia	100	12
Denmark	1,000	1,000
France	2,447	1,000
Germany	1,000	1,000
Greece	1,000	1,000
Hungary	1,000	1,000
Italy	1,000	1,000
Japan	1,000	1,000
Korea	1,000	1,000
Latvia	1,000	1,000
Lithuania	1,000	1,000
Malta	1,000	1,000
Mexico	1,000	1,000
Montenegro	1,000	1,000
Norway	1,000	1,000
Poland	1,000	1,000
Portugal	1,000	1,000
Romania	1,000	1,000
Serbia	1,000	1,000
Slovakia	1,000	1,000
Slovenia	1,000	1,000
Spain	1,000	1,000
Sweden	1,000	1,000
Switzerland	1,000	1,000
Turkey	1,000	1,000
Ukraine	1,000	1,000
United States	1,000	1,000
Yugoslavia	1,000	1,000

1924

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—HOUSE

5899

	Present quota, per cent, 1924	Per cent, 1909
Spain.....	212	21
Italy.....	26,724	5,791
Poland.....	2,175	1,033
United Kingdom.....	17,342	62,438
France.....	6,423	515
Other Europe.....	36	2
Sweden.....	17	1
China.....	224	13
Germany.....	2,568	223
Other Asia.....	81	65
Africa.....	129	24
Albania.....	221	41
Australia.....	479	139
New Zealand and other islands.....	80	43
Total.....	52,535	128,602

Note these startling figures: The quota for Greece is reduced from 3,204 to 47; Hungary's from 5,038 to 474; Italy's from 42,007 to 3,942; Poland's from 21,070 to 5,175; and similar reductions are to be observed for all those countries which have supplied what is now known as the "new immigration."

Another interesting table is the following, which gives the number of quota immigrants and the number of their relatives to be admitted under the proposed act, as compared with the number of immigrants admitted under the law in force during the past ten years:

Nationality	Quota im- migrants admitted under the act of May 12, 1924	Quota and quota re- latives im- migrants admitted under the present law past ten years	Relative percentage
United Kingdom.....	71,942	128,295	100.0
Germany.....	67,027	102,304	102.3
France.....	1,128	1,228	108.8
Norway.....	12,302	11,300	108.8
Denmark.....	3,443	5,079	106.2
Sweden.....	21,022	14,329	67.2
Poland.....	11,178	15,713	56.5
United States.....	8,586	7,586	55.8
China.....	2,553	2,000	52.9
Yugoslavia.....	4,126	7,172	72.9
Czechoslovakia.....	11,247	4,807	26.7
Hungary.....	5,103	1,349	22.5
Italy.....	42,707	8,223	78.6

Proponents of this measure maintain there are too many southern Europeans in America. Yet for the two years of the present bill's existence the net result between immigration to and emigration from this country indicates there are 4,619 less Greeks here, 4,038 less Portuguese, 10,343 less Spaniards, while the Italians show a slight increase of 2,307, and Yugoslavians have remained about stationary.

In order to justify his opinion, man is capable of some splendid demonstrations of mental superabundance. Two years ago, when a bill similar to the one under consideration was before the House, the committee proposing the measure said in its report:

It should be stated that the reduction of the quotas of the foreign born in the United States, according to the 1890 census, is not proposed for reasons in any sense discriminatory.

Yet the author of the present bill, writing for the Nation's Dispatch for the issue of July, 1921, said:

Immigrants and persons of various nationalities in and from the United States the past two years.

Country of last residence	Admitted 1922	Departed 1922	Increase (+) or decrease (-)	Admitted 1923	Departed 1923	Increase (+) or decrease (-)	Total increase (+) or decrease (-)
Austria.....	3,107	228	+2,879	1,208	337	+871	+12,271
Belgium.....	304	18	+286	127	226	+91	+29
Canada.....	12,641	8,430	+4,211	14,002	1,071	+12,931	+13,728
Czechoslovakia.....	12,428	9,208	+3,220	55,073	1,740	+53,333	+53,753
Czechs.....	1,509	8,000	-6,491	1,205	1,205	0	-6,491
Italy.....	42,413	36,017	+6,396	55,036	27,840	+27,196	+27,196
Poland.....	5,002	2,114	+2,888	12,575	1,000	+11,575	+11,575
Polish.....	5,002	2,114	+2,888	12,575	1,000	+11,575	+11,575
Portugal.....	2,009	6,700	-4,691	2,004	2,713	-709	-709
Russia.....	17,074	1,000	+16,074	17,074	2,004	+15,070	+15,070
Spain.....	1,129	11,115	-9,986	1,129	1,129	0	-9,986
Sweden.....	7,108	2,717	+4,391	15,428	1,900	+13,528	+13,528
United Kingdom.....	69,008	18,142	+50,866	72,028	8,344	+63,684	+63,684
Yugoslavia.....	4,720	10,129	-5,409	8,500	4,500	+4,000	+4,000
Yugoslav, Serb, Croat, Slovene.....	11,000	11,000	0	12,000	12,000	0	0
Mexico.....	10,000	10,000	0	10,000	10,000	0	0

The new measure thus aims to change the character of our future immigration by cutting down the number of those who can come from southern and eastern Europe. In other words, it is recognized that, on the whole, northern and western Europe furnish the best material for citizenship.

In the Journal of Commerce on January 15, 1924, W. W. Hubbard, Commissioner General of Immigration said that the purpose of the law—

is clearly to leave the way wide open for all northern and western Europeans who may desire to come, but to close the doors as much as possible to those coming from southern and eastern Europe.

The position assumed two years ago by the proponents of this bill rested on the assumption that there was no discrimination on the basis of its philosophy, yet to-day that position has been abandoned for one admittedly discriminatory against the Italian, the Hungarian, the Pole, and the people of those other nations of southern and eastern Europe. No longer is there any question of the real issue in this controversy. It focuses itself on the theory that because a youngster was reared in his cradle in the city of Naples, or of Budapest, or of Athens he is not wanted in America, because he comes from stock which is alleged to be inferior to that of his brother in the north.

In the background of this doctrine of the inferiority of the southern European, a rather extraordinary action is built relating to a race known as the Nordic, which appears to have been quite overlooked by the anthropologists until recently. Where this race had its origin is a matter of great conjecture, and an equal amount of light is thrown upon the manner in which it reached the lands its people now occupy. The anthropologists do say, however, that the Nordic is a dolichocephalic race, whose men are tall, blond, blue-eyed, rugged, and handsome. Being somewhat in doubt as to the meaning of the word "dolichocephalic," I consulted my dictionary to learn that it means the possession of a cephalic index of 77.0 or less. Thereafter, and still in the pursuit of learning, I discovered that "cephalic index" means the ratio of the breadth of the cranium to the length, usually expressed by a number denoting hundredths of the length, which ordinarily is measured from the glabella to the most prominent part of the occiput. The habitat of this race is mostly in Scandinavia, Scotland, and the north of England. While it is claimed that this race is vastly superior to others in deeds of daring, in vitality, in mentality, and in stalwartness, it would appear anomalous that this race is now passing away, and with all the rugged qualities graciously bestowed upon it, at least by the anthropologists, races which are alleged to be inferior have been the cause of its gradual extermination.

But wherein do we find the alleged superiority of the one over the other? Surely, if performance in the past count for aught, the people of Italy have much of which to be proud. Italy can well boast of a history wherein leaders of the world in art, science, and philosophy have played their part. What other nation has given a poet greater than Dante, a sculptor greater than Michael Angelo, a painter greater than Titian, a scientist greater than Galileo, an explorer greater than Marco Polo? Perhaps we occasionally forget that America was discovered by a Genoese whose unravel was manned by Jews, Portuguese, Spaniards, and Italians, men of those very races whose exclusion is now sought.

The following table shows the net increase or decrease of the various nationalities through immigration to and emigration from the United States for the past two years:

5900

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—HOUSE

APRIL 8

As usually happens in movements of national import, those most active in the late out of a measure are those least affected. The State of Connecticut, with a large foreign-born population, is naturally chiefly interested in the immigration problem. Yet Connecticut has much to cry against the Italian, the Hungarian, or the Pole as an inferior type. To be sure, there are some among these numbers who are not the most desirable, but of what nation or race is not the same thing true? Racism and xenophobia may be found in any country, whether it be American, Italy, or Sweden. It is no just criticism of a nation to single out the exception and have a critical conclusion thereon.

As one who has shared shoulders all his life with the immigrant from almost every land, in a State where the immigrant has settled in large numbers, I feel that I know something of their habits, their lives, and their desirability. Take the Italian. Whenever he has settled, he has been industrious, law-abiding, and ambitious. He buys a little farm to till the soil, he starts a little business, or perhaps he works in the mill. But wherever he is, he adds to our prosperity. He is ambitious for his children and their education, and these God, he usually has plenty of time, a few more minutes, thinking by some of our modernism, as though the immigrant had been torn into the world was a sign of inferiority.

He becomes naturalized in a comparatively short time; he tries to become American. His tendencies are not those of a radical. The foreign-born population of Rhode Island, consisting largely of Italian and Irish, amounts to 42.1 per cent, yet the total Socialist vote in this State at the last election was but 2.3 per cent. Wisconsin, which has a small population of the foreign immigration, has a large number of the Socialists, while a Socialist vote of 12.1 per cent. Connecticut, which is second in the number of foreign-born whites with a total of 41.2 per cent, cast but 2.5 per cent for the Socialist Party. Evidently all the great leaders of radicalism in this country come from the old-time stock, while few, if any, are the product of the newer immigration.

But the crowding usual to the people of southern Europe comes when we exclude them at the front door and permit to enter at the back door hordes of Mexicans. Last year 1,000,000 Mexicans came into the States and a million more could have done likewise had they so desired, for there is no quota law, no restriction of any sort for our southern neighbors. I do not know what standard is used to measure desirability, but I do know that the average Italian is as much superior to the average Mexican as a full-blooded Alaskan is to a nigger. Let this bill will permit every Mexican in Mexico to enter the United States, and the same bill limits the number of Danes to 3,072 immigrants.

The impression is prevalent among some of the Members of this Congress that the Johnson bill develops a sharp line between the sons of Italy and the sons of the American Revolution. A statement of that sort brings answers to my mind a crowd of memories which bring into the closing number the American flag to pull it out and out of immediacy. However, there are some associations which appear to have taken a position against this bill, whose names indicate a background of good American stock. Such a list includes among others, the following organizations:

United Industries of Wisconsin.
West Virginia Manufacturers' Association.
Tennessee Manufacturers' Association.
American Cotton Manufacturers' Association.
American Machine Tooling Association.
American Hardware Manufacturers' Association.
American Machine Tooling Association.
American Paper and Pulp Association.
American Air Line Association.
Electric Manufacturers' Council.
Institute of Mines and Explosives.
Manufacturing Chemists' Association of the United States.
National Association of Cotton Manufacturers.
National Association of Farm Equipment Manufacturers.
National Association of Producers of Cotton Fabric.
National Association of Manufacturers of the United States of America.

National Association of Sheet and Tin Tube Manufacturers (Inc.).
National Association of West Manufacturers.
National Automobile Chemists of Commerce.
National Iron and Steel Manufacturers' Association of the United States (Inc.).

National Electric Light Association.
National Electric Association.
National Furriers' Association.

National Industrial Council.
National Lumber Manufacturers' Association.
National Metal Working Association.
National Oil Manufacturers' Association.
National Association of America (Inc.).
Sole Association of America.
Trucking Merchants' Association of the United States.
United States Barber Co.
Zeller Department, Michigan State Co.
National Association of Manufacturers of the United States.
National Foundry Association.
California Manufacturers' Association.
Manufacturers' Association of Connecticut (Inc.).
Manufacturers' Association of Washington (Inc.).
Associated Industries of the Island of Hawaii (Hawaii).
Indiana Manufacturers' Association.
Iowa Manufacturers' Association.
Associated Industries of Kansas.
Associated Industries of Kentucky.
Associated Industries of Maine.
Merchants and Manufacturers' Association of Baltimore.
Associated Industries of Massachusetts.
Michigan Manufacturers' Association.
Associated Industries of Missouri.
New York Manufacturers' Association.
Associated Industries of New York State (Inc.).
Ohio Manufacturers' Association.
Oklahoma Employers' Association.
Manufacturers and Merchants' Association of Oregon.
Pennsylvania Manufacturers' Association.
Rhode Island Manufacturers' Association.
Manufacturers and Merchants' Association of South Dakota.
Tennessee Manufacturers' Association.
Utah Associated Industries.
Associated Industries of Vermont.
Virginia Manufacturers' Association.

Mr. Chairman, there is a mighty big difference between restriction and discrimination. If it is restriction we seek, you may rely on my support. The workers in our mills and factories must be protected against an influx of millions who will seek their place. But I can not agree to any policy that violates all prior adopted American ideas. With such a bill, crowded on discrimination, we do violence to traditions that have come down to us from the fathers, and as well do we offer insult to those large groups of our citizens of the blood of southern Europe by proclaiming that they are of an inferior breed of human being.

But the main thought is a criticism of those societies with foreign-sounding titles, such as the Order of the Sons of Italy, which have petitioned against the passage of this bill. Since when has a man's love for his country been tested by the name of some fraternal or sporting society of which he may be a member? What if these people of foreign parentage had themselves together for beneficial reasons so long as the laws of this land is not placed in jeopardy? Am I any the less an American if I, perchance, belong to some society with a name suggestive of Ireland? And who will deny my Americanism if I take pride in the glory of that land or hope for her prosperity and happiness, or if, forsooth, I take a little Irish stir on St. Patrick's Day, or wear a sprig of shamrock?

My own humble judgment is that he lacks some element in his makeup who does not retain warm affection for the land of his forebears.

A short journey it is from this building to Arlington Cemetery, where rests amid lavishly appointed the body of the unknown soldier. Perhaps he was an Italian, who may have belonged to the Order of the Sons of Italy, for our Army numbered 1,200,000 Italians, of whom 20,000 were killed. Is there anyone with such so untried with prejudices as to lower this unknown from his undisturbed place of human because, first, he was an Italian? Let me relate the tale of a little Italian lad, whom I had the privilege and honor of knowing during the winter after the war I met him for the first time. He was tottering up the street, a decrepit, pathetic figure, almost lost in an overalls army overcoat that seemed to swallow his whole form. He was bent almost in two, partly from pain, but mainly from his new deformities. His eyes were like burning coals; his feet, wide apart, his mouth, thin and narrow, wrinkled his forehead. The nose was injured and ragged, while the shins he wore had fallen to pieces, and at the end you could see his toes. He told me his name was Jimmy Conzolino. He had been in the country a short time when the war was declared, and he had joined the army. He had been gassed, and it was most apparent he was suffering severely

from tuberculosis. He had been ill with a bit of shrapnel in the back and leg, and a part of his spine had been affected. The wonder of it all was that the lad was alive to tell it. Whether it was due to his faith or to that of the Federal Government is immaterial. The fact was that Jimmy was receiving no attention from the Government—from his Government—and he was sitting out his number living in the hands of his good friends. But not a whisper would he utter against the delay of the Government in providing him with his due. Eventually his faith was recognized, and he received his first real money. I met him again when he was given a day off from the hospital. "Jimmy, why don't you go back to Italy, where your folks are?" I said to him. "You have nobody near to you in America, and it might do you a lot of good to go back to your country." Jimmy's English was wretched; I doubt if he could read or write. But I did understand him when he said, "Italy is a good country. This country is my country. I fight for this. I die in this." Jimmy's prophetic words, true, for he died shortly thereafter. He has gone to the land that does not discriminate against the Italian. And in the days to come, as the records of loyalty to country are disclosed, I will wager that Jimmy's name will stand out with greater glory than many of those self-proclaimed perfect Americans who want to keep other Americans from our shores, because they do not make good Americans.

I insert an article entitled "Eight American soldiers," which carries the same name.

EIGHT AMERICAN SOLDIERS (By Samuel McCoy)

The heroism of the eight Americans whom I am about to name was disclosed in every one of the hundreds of incidents which were sent from America to serve in France. I name these eight men merely because their war records happen to be before me at the moment, and because much has been said of late in regard to the proper qualifications for American citizenship.

Each of these men was awarded the distinguished-service cross. Twenty thousand men who fought in the same division in which they followed all recognized themselves with honor in the face of danger. A thousand men of the division were singled out to appear in the divisional exercises for acts of heroism performed in that campaign, but these eight were singled out from them all. They were at the head of the line who won the distinguished-service cross—a decoration awarded only "for extraordinary heroism in action."

The first man, a corporal, in the assault landed against the seemingly impenetrable Hindenburg line, "although twice wounded, refused to leave the field and continued with his platoon, exhibiting magnificent courage and bravery until he was wounded a third time. His devotion to duty set a splendid example to the men of his company."

The second, a corporal, in the same fearful fire of the enemy, "was an advance scout for his platoon. The platoon was temporarily halted to establish and fix down a section of the enemy trench in their immediate front. He rushed through the heavy enemy fire to the trench, got at the point of the rifle, completed it of the enemy to surround. He then rushed for his machine to advance."

The third, also a corporal, "left shelter, went forward under intense machine-gun fire, and carried a wounded officer to safety. In accomplishing this mission he was severely wounded."

The fourth man, a private, first class, "when the advance of his battalion was checked by heavy machine-gun fire, went forward, with two other soldiers, under heavy fire to reconquer the enemy position. By effective rifle fire they drove the enemy from two machine-gun positions a short way off, which they captured, together with 20 prisoners, in doing so."

The fifth man, also a private, "after being severely wounded by shrapnel, took shelter in a shell hole somewhat in advance of his company, from which he had become separated in the fog and smoke. He saw the lines of fire of his wounded comrades who were occupying the shell hole by throwing his grenade, which had been tossed into the shell hole by members of his own company in the past, into the enemy's lines."

The sixth, a private, "under heavy small and machine-gun fire, left the shelter of his trench, and going forward under a thick smoke screen, went forward captured between 20 and 25 prisoners." Three weeks later, in a second battle, after the advance of his company had been stopped by strong hostile machine-gun fire, he, with three companions, advanced the ahead of the front line to attack an enemy position hidden in a large farmhouse. By skillful maneuvering in the house, daylight they cornered all entrance to the house and forced the surrender of the entire force of the enemy, numbering 36 men and 2 officers. During the assault they killed 3 of the enemy, who attempted to take cover in the cellar."

The seventh, a private, "exhibited exceptional bravery by leaving shelter and going into an enemy trench under heavy machine-gun and shell fire to rescue wounded soldiers."

The eighth man, also a private, "while the advance against the Hindenburg line was at its height, seeing an American machine gunner exposed to the enemy, ran to his assistance. On the way he was seriously wounded, but continued on, reaching the position and using his body to shield the gunner while the latter poured a fire into the enemy. He was wounded three times, finally losing consciousness, but after his wounds were dressed he insisted on leaving the field unaided."

The names of these eight American soldiers, all of whom are still living, are John A. J. Blissett, Louis J. Moscow, Alvin Karpis, Isaac Robinson, Richard A. Smith, Weyl Kolesch, Daniel Moskowitz, and Antony Seisler.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. Bacon], a member of the committee.

Mr. BACON. Mr. Chairman, that we are facing a crisis in our policy as a people toward immigration there can be no doubt. We must determine whether the old plan in regard to immigration shall be reverted to, whether all further immigration shall be shut out, whether there shall be a reduction based upon census figures, such as in the extension of the present law, or whether some other solution shall be found.

I dare say that no question confronting the country during the entire period of its history has ever been fraught with such enormous consequences as this one of what new blood shall be fused with our stock, what new energies shall be added to the future of American life, what new elements shall compete with our labor, and what new points of view shall contribute to our political and social ideas and ideals. The scientific results of immigration are so exact that eye children and our children's children can not but enjoy or suffer from the effects of what we do at this time. Therefore it deserves upon us to consider all the facts in the broadest and most patriotic light possible. As a member of the Committee on Immigration, I have tried to do so.

I have tried to approach this subject with an open mind, but solely, however, from the viewpoint of what is best for this country of ours and for its other country. I am convinced that what is for the best interest of the United States on this immigration question may be diametrically opposed to the selfish interest of other countries.

We are the greatest immigrant-receiving country in the world today, and probably the greatest in history. Nearly 10,000,000 immigrants have come to our shores during the last 15 years, and during 4 of those 15 years the World War stopped immigration entirely. The vital influence on the history of civilization of the immigration of people can not be minimized and should not be ignored. The Secretary of Labor recently has said:

One of the prime factors in the building of civilization since the days when the first peopling was completed for this dwelling, the story of the time that he had killed has been the migration of people. Throughout the ages, wherever a new race of people has set up a strong, vigorous, comfortable state of life they have looked the thought of less advanced races seeking the ease of the latter civilization. There is no instance in all history when the latter, standing in danger of extinction by their enemies, succeeded in turning their backs into the Roman Empire, which does not demonstrate that even so late the immigrant people overthrew the older civilization. This has not been accomplished by force or by armed invasion. In almost every instance great civilizations have perished through peaceful penetration of alien who were additions to the work of the community. In some cases they drifted in as free labor, many entered as slaves, or as soldiers in the employ of the higher civilization. In every case, however, these migrations have resulted in the enrichment of the higher civilization by the laboring alien.

But few of these migrations of the past have been characterized by great movements of population in short periods of time. Only some 200,000 Goths were in the original group which the Empire Valens accepted as residents of Italy. There have been in the history of all empires a like movement of people of the boundaries of the tide of immigration which has come to the United States during the last century and a half.

Every nation, at least of Europe, is an emigrant-sending country. There you have at once the great clash of different interests. Every foreign country and every foreign empire as they have in Washington is watching the debate on this bill with intense interest. It behooves Americans to watch also.

We can be sympathetic to Europe's efforts to solve some of their problems by encouraging their people to come to this country, but we must never lose sight of the fact that this is an American problem and only an American problem. Unless we in this country look after ourselves and our own interests no one will do it for us.